arXiv:1303.0549v1 [math.NT] 3 Mar 2013

# HEIGHTS OF KUDLA-RAPOPORT DIVISORS AND DERIVATIVES OF $L$-FUNCTIONS

JAN HENDRIK BRUINIER, BENJAMIN HOWARD, AND TONGHAI YANG

Abstract. We study special cycles on integral models of Shimura varieties associated with unitary similitude groups of signature $(n-1,1)$. We construct an arithmetic theta lift from harmonic Maass forms of weight $2-n$ to the first arithmetic Chow group of a toroidal compactification of the integral model of the unitary Shimura variety, by associating to a harmonic Maass form $f$ a suitable linear combination of Kudla-Rapoport divisors, equipped with the Green function given by the regularized theta lift of $f$. Our main result expresses the height pairing of this arithmetic Kudla-Rapoport divisor with a CM cycle in terms of a Rankin-Selberg convolution $L$-function of the cusp form of weight $n$ corresponding to $f$ and the theta function of a positive definite hermitian lattice of rank $n-1$. When specialized to the case $n=2$, this result can be viewed as a variant of the Gross-Zagier formula for Shimura curves associated to unitary groups of signature $(1,1)$. We also prove that the generating series of the height pairings of arithmetic Kudla-Rapoport divisors with a fixed CM cycle is an elliptic modular form of weight $n$. These results rely on (among other things) a new method for computing improper arithmetic intersections.

## Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Preliminaries 10
3. Shimura varieties and their divisors 13
4. Green functions on toroidal compactifications 17
5. Integral models of Shimura varieties 28
6. CM values of automorphic Green functions 43
7. Metrized line bundles and derivatives of $L$-functions 51
8. Arithmetic cycles classes and derivatives of $L$-functions 70
9. Scalar valued modular forms 75

References 85

## 1. Introduction

Let $\boldsymbol{k} \subset \mathbb{C}$ be an imaginary quadratic field of odd discriminant $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, let $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ be the different of $\boldsymbol{k}$, and abbreviate $D = |d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|$. Let $\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ be the quadratic Dirichlet character determined by the extension $\boldsymbol{k}/\mathbb{Q}$.

---

*Date*: March 5, 2013.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14G35, 14G40, 11G18, 11F27.

The first author is partially supported by DFG grant BR-2163/2-2. The second author is partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1201480. The third author is partially supported by a NSF grant DMS-1200380 and a Chinese grant.

1.1. **Motivation: heights of Heegner points.** To motivate the results of this paper, we first recall the results of Gross and Zagier [GZ] relating the heights of Heegner points on modular curves to central derivatives of Rankin-Selberg convolution $L$-functions. Fix a normalized new eigenform

$$g(\tau) \in S_2(\Gamma_0(N)),$$

and assume that $N$ and $\boldsymbol{k}$ satisfy the usual Heegner hypothesis: every prime divisor of $N$ splits in $\boldsymbol{k}$. This allows us to fix an ideal $\mathfrak{n} \subset \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ satisfying $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}/\mathfrak{n} \cong \mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$. For any fractional $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-ideal $\mathfrak{a}$, the cyclic $N$-isogeny of elliptic curves

$$y_{\mathfrak{a}} = [\mathbb{C}/\mathfrak{a} \to \mathbb{C}/\mathfrak{n}^{-1}\mathfrak{a}]$$

defines a *Heegner point* on $X_0(N)(H)$, where $H$ is the Hilbert class field of $\boldsymbol{k}$. If we define a weight 2 cuspform

$$\Theta^{\mathrm{Heeg}}(\tau) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} T_m(y_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} - \infty) q^m$$

valued in $J_0(N)(H)$, where the $T_m$ are Hecke operators, then the geometric theta lifting

$$\Theta^{\mathrm{Heeg}}(g) = \langle \Theta^{\mathrm{Heeg}}, g \rangle_{\mathrm{Pet}} \in J_0(N)(H) \otimes \mathbb{C}$$

is essentially the projection of the divisor $y_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} - \infty$ to the $g$-isotypic component of the Jacobian $J_0(N)$.

After endowing the fractional ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ with the self-dual hermitian form $\langle x, y\rangle = \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{a})^{-1} x\bar{y}$, we may construct the weight one theta series

$$\theta_{\mathfrak{a}}(\tau) = \sum_{x \in \mathfrak{a}} q^{\langle x, x\rangle} \in M_1(\Gamma_0(D), \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}).$$

The Rankin-Selberg convolution $L$-function $L(g, \theta_{\mathfrak{a}}, s)$ satisfies a functional equation forcing it to vanish at $s = 1$, and the Gross-Zagier theorem implies

$$\left[\Theta^{\mathrm{Heeg}}(g) : y_{\mathfrak{a}} - \infty\right]_{\mathrm{NT}} = c \cdot L'(g, \theta_{\mathfrak{a}}, 1).$$

Here $c$ is some explicit nonzero constant, and the pairing on the left is the Néron-Tate height.

The goal of this paper is to obtain similar results when $g$ is replaced by a cusp form of higher weight, the fractional ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ is replaced by a hermitian lattice of higher rank, and the Heegner points on modular curves are replaced by special cycles on Shimura varieties associated to groups of unitary similitudes.

1.2. **Speculation in higher weight.** Fix an $n \geq 2$, and any cusp form

$$g(\tau) = \sum_m a(m) q^m \in S_n(\Gamma_0(D), \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^n).$$

We do not require that $g$ be an eigenform. Let $\Lambda$ be a positive definite self-dual hermitian lattice of rank $n-1$; that is, a projective $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module of rank $n-1$ endowed with a positive definite hermitian form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ inducing an isomorphism $\Lambda \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(\Lambda, \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$. The coefficient of $q^m$ in the weight $n-1$ theta series

$$\theta_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{sc}}(\tau) = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} q^{\langle x, x\rangle} \in M_{n-1}(\Gamma_0(D), \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{n-1})$$

is the representation number

$$R_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{sc}}(m) = |\{x \in \Lambda : \langle x, x\rangle = m\}|$$

(the superscript sc is a reminder that this is a scalar valued theta series; throughout most of the paper we work with vector valued theta series.) From this data we may construct the Rankin-Selberg convolution $L$-function

$$L(g,\theta_\Lambda^{\mathrm{sc}},s)=\Gamma\big(\frac{s}{2}+n-1\big)\sum_{m\geq 1}\frac{\overline{a(m)}R_\Lambda^{\mathrm{sc}}(m)}{(4\pi m)^{\frac{s}{2}+n-1}}. \tag{1.2.1}$$

Our normalization is different from that of Gross and Zagier; in this normalization the point of interest is at $s=0$. Note that our cusp form $g$ has level $D$, and so we are far away from the Heegner hypothesis. In particular, there is no reason to expect the Rankin-Selberg $L$-function to vanish at $s=0$. All the same, it makes sense to ask if the behavior at $s=0$ is related to the Arakelov intersection multiplicity of some cycles on a Shimura variety.

For a pair of nonnegative integers $(p,q)$, denote by $M_{(p,q)}$ the moduli space of principally polarized abelian varieties $A\to S$ over $\boldsymbol{k}$-schemes, equipped with an action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ satisfying the *signature* $(p,q)$ *condition*: every $a\in\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ acts on $\mathrm{Lie}(A)$ with characteristic polynomial $(T-a)^p(T-\overline{a})^q$. We require also that the Rosati involution on $\mathrm{End}(A)\otimes\mathbb{Q}$ restrict to complex conjugation on the image of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. The moduli space $M_{(p,q)}$ is a Deligne-Mumford stack, smooth over $\boldsymbol{k}$ of dimension $pq$. It is a disjoint union of Shimura varieties associated to unitary similitude groups. The theory of integral models of these stacks remains incomplete, but we only need two special cases:

1. there is a smooth stack $\mathtt{M}_{(p,0)}$ over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ with generic fiber $M_{(p,0)}$,
2. there is a regular and flat stack $\mathtt{M}_{(p,1)}$ over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ with generic fiber $M_{(p,1)}$.

In both cases the integral model is defined by imposing a slightly refined version of the signature condition. The flatness and regularity of $\mathtt{M}_{(p,1)}$ are due to Pappas and Krämer. See Section 5.1 for details. The product

$$\mathtt{M}=\mathtt{M}_{(1,0)}\times_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\mathtt{M}_{(n-1,1)}$$

is an $n$-dimensional regular algebraic stack, flat over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. The complex fiber $\mathtt{M}(\mathbb{C})$ is disconnected, and its connected components are indexed by the finitely many isomorphism classes of self-dual hermitian lattices of signature $(n-1,1)$. After [Lan] and [Ho3], the stack $\mathtt{M}$ has a canonical toroidal compactification $\mathtt{M}^*$, whose boundary is a smooth divisor.

The stack $\mathtt{M}$ comes equipped with a family of *Kudla-Rapoport divisors* $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})$, introduced in [KR1] and studied further in [KR2], [Ho2], and [Ho3]. Here $\mathfrak{r}$ is an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-ideal dividing $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and $m\in\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r})^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$ is positive. These divisors correspond, roughly speaking, to embeddings

$$\mathrm{GU}(n-2,1)\longrightarrow\mathrm{GU}(n-1,1).$$

The precise definition is as follows. Given a pair $(A_0,A)\in\mathtt{M}(S)$, the $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module

$$L(A_0,A)=\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(A_0,A)$$

carries a natural positive definite hermitian form. The stack $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})$ is defined as the moduli space of triples $(A_0,A,\lambda)$ in which $(A_0,A)$ is a point of $\mathtt{M}$, and $\lambda\in\mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0,A)$ has hermitian norm $m$. There is an additional vanishing condition imposed on the action of $\sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\cdot\lambda$ on Lie algebras, for which we refer the reader to Definition 5.1.5 and Remark 5.1.7.

On the open Shimura variety $\mathtt{M}$ there is a natural way to construct Green functions for the Kudla-Rapoport divisors, based on the ideas of [Br1] (when $n=2$, there is some mild ambiguity in the normalization of the Green function, but we ignore this subtlety in the introduction). By analyzing the behavior of the Green function near the boundary of the toroidal compactification, we show that one can add a prescribed linear combination of boundary components to $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})$ in order to obtain the *total arithmetic Kudla-Rapoport divisors*

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}(m,\mathfrak{r}) \in \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*).$$

The right hand side is the arithmetic Chow group with complex coefficients, defined, as in the work of Gillet-Soulé [SABK], as the space of rational equivalence classes of divisors endowed with Green functions. In fact, we must use the more general arithmetic Chow groups defined by Burgos-Kramer-Kühn [BKK], which allow for Green functions with log-log singularities along the boundary. Our Green functions are constructed as regularized theta lifts of harmonic Maass forms, as in [Br1], [BF], and [BY], and so are different from the Kudla-style Green functions used in [Ho2] and [Ho3]. Extend the definition to $m=0$ by setting

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}(0,\mathfrak{r}) = \widehat{\mathtt{T}}^*,$$

where the right hand side is the *metrized cotautological bundle* on $\mathtt{M}^*$, defined in Section 7.2 on the open Shimura variety, and extended to $\mathtt{M}^*$ in Section 8.1.

Restricting to $\mathfrak{r} = \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, one may form the formal generating series

$$\widehat{\Theta}(\tau) = \sum_{m\geq 0} \widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}(m,\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}) \cdot q^m \in \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*)[[q]]. \tag{1.2.2}$$

Conjecturally, this formal generating series is a modular form of the same weight, level, and nebentypus as $g$, in the sense that

$$\sum_{m\geq 0} \rho\big(\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}(m,\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}})\big) \cdot q^m \in M_n(\Gamma_0(D),\chi^n_{\boldsymbol{k}})$$

for any linear functional $\rho : \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*) \to \mathbb{C}$. If this is true, then it makes sense to form the Petersson inner product

$$\widehat{\Theta}^{\mathrm{conj}}(g) = \langle \widehat{\Theta}, g\rangle_{\mathrm{Pet}} \in \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*). \tag{1.2.3}$$

This conjectural arithmetic cycle class, whose construction is based on the ideas of Kudla [Ku4], is the *arithmetic theta lift of* $g$.

The moduli space $\mathtt{M}$ contains another cycle, which corresponds, roughly speaking, to an embedding of a compact unitary group

$$\mathrm{GU}(n-1,0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{GU}(n-1,1).$$

More precisely, we first define a stack

$$\mathtt{Y} = \mathtt{M}_{(1,0)} \times_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \mathtt{M}_{(0,1)} \times_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \mathtt{M}_{(n-1,0)}.$$

It is smooth of relative dimension 0 over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and the morphism $\mathtt{Y} \to \mathtt{M}$ defined by

$$(A_0,A_1,B) \mapsto (A_0, A_1 \times B)$$

allows us to view $\mathtt{Y}$ as a 1-dimensional cycle on $\mathtt{M}$. To every geometric point $(A_0,A_1,B)$ there is an associated self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(A_1,B)$ of signature $(n-1,0)$, whose isomorphism class is constant on each connected component of $\mathtt{Y}$. Let $\mathtt{Y}_\Lambda \subset \mathtt{Y}$ be the union of all connected components on which $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(A_1,B) \cong \Lambda$.

Our aim is an equality of the form

$$[\widehat{\Theta}^{\mathrm{conj}}(g) : \mathtt{Y}_\Lambda] \overset{?}{=} L'(g,\theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_\Lambda,0), \tag{1.2.4}$$

where the pairing on the left is the arithmetic intersection, defined as the composition

$$\widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*) \longrightarrow \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{Y}_\Lambda) \xrightarrow{\widehat{\deg}} \mathbb{C}.$$

Before one attempts to prove such a formula, there are two obstructions to even finding the correct statement. On the right hand side, the construction of (1.2.1) is a bit too naive, and must be modified to ensure that it has a nice functional equation forcing it to vanish at $s = 0$. Much more seriously, on the left hand side we do not know the modularity of the generating series $\widehat{\Theta}(\tau)$, and so the existence of the class $\widehat{\Theta}^{\mathrm{conj}}(g)$ remains mere speculation.

To fix the problem on the right, we introduce vector valued modular forms. There is an induction map $g \mapsto \vec{g}$ from $S_n(\Gamma_0(D), \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^n)$ to a certain space of cusp forms valued in a finite-dimensional representation of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. Similarly, the above theta series $\theta_\Lambda^{\mathrm{sc}}$ has a vector valued counterpart $\theta_\Lambda$. If one imitates the construction of the convolution $L$-function (1.2.1) with these vector valued forms, the resulting $L$-function has a simple functional equation in $s \mapsto -s$, which forces it to vanish at $s = 0$, see (6.4.2).

To fix problem on the left, we introduce a space of vector valued harmonic Maass forms of weight $2 - n$, on which one can define, unconditionally, an arithmetic theta lift. This space of harmonic Maass forms is then related to the space of holomorphic cusp forms of weight $n$ via a differential operator $\xi$. In the next subsection we explain these ideas in more detail, and state the main results.

1.3. **Statement of the main results.** To a hermitian module $\mathscr{V}$ over the adele ring $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ there is an associated *invariant* $\mathrm{inv}(\mathscr{V}) \in \{\pm 1\}$, defined as a product of local invariants. If $\mathrm{inv}(\mathscr{V}) = 1$ then $\mathscr{V}$ is *coherent*, in the sense that $\mathscr{V}$ arises as the adelization of a hermitian space over $\boldsymbol{k}$. Otherwise, $\mathscr{V}$ is *incoherent*. In Section 2.1 we define the notion of a *hermitian* $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$*-module* $\mathscr{L}$. Essentially, $\mathscr{L}$ is an integral structure on a hermitian $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module. It consists of an archimedean part $\mathscr{L}_\infty$, which is a hermitian space over $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}} = \boldsymbol{k} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$, and a finite part $\mathscr{L}_f$, which is a hermitian $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module. As explained in Section 5.1, to each point of the moduli space $\mathtt{M}$ there is associated a hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module, whose isomorphism class is constant on the connected components of $\mathtt{M}$. Thus we obtain a decomposition

$$\mathtt{M} = \bigsqcup_{\mathscr{L}} \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$$

where $\mathscr{L}$ runs over all incoherent self-dual hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-modules of signature $(n, 0)$. Similarly, the stack $\mathtt{Y}_\Lambda$ admits a decomposition

$$\mathtt{Y}_\Lambda = \bigsqcup_{\mathscr{L}_0} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)},$$

where $\mathscr{L}_0$ runs over all incoherent self-dual hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-modules of signature $(1, 0)$. From now on we fix one such $\mathscr{L}_0$, and set $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{L}_0 \oplus \Lambda$; for the meaning of the direct sum, see Remark 5.2.3. The morphism $\mathtt{Y}_\Lambda \to \mathtt{M}$ restricts to a morphism $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)} \to \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$, and we denote by $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m, \mathfrak{r})$ the restriction of the Kudla-Rapoport divisor $\mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r})$ to $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$.

The hermitian form on $\mathscr{L}_f$ determines a $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$-valued quadratic form on the finite discriminant group $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f / \mathscr{L}_f$. If we denote by $S_{\mathscr{L}}$ the space of complex valued functions on this finite quadratic space, there is a Weil representation $\omega_{\mathscr{L}} : \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \to \mathrm{Aut}(S_{\mathscr{L}})$. Let $S_n(\overline{\omega}_{\mathscr{L}})$ be the space of weight $n$ cusp forms for $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ with values in $S_{\mathscr{L}}$, transforming according to the complex conjugate representation $\overline{\omega}_{\mathscr{L}}$. In Section 9.1 we define an induction map

$$S_n(\Gamma_0(D), \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^n) \to S_n(\overline{\omega}_{\mathscr{L}})^\Delta,$$

where $\Delta$ is the automorphism group of the finite group $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f / \mathscr{L}_f$ with its $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ valued quadratic form. This map is denoted $g \mapsto \vec{g}$. The vector valued modular form $\vec{g}$ has a

$q$-expansion

$$\vec{g}(\tau) = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}} \vec{a}(m)q^m$$

with $\vec{a}(m) \in S_{\mathscr{L}}$.

Let $S_\Lambda$ be the space of complex valued functions on $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\Lambda/\Lambda$. There is a vector valued theta series

$$\theta_\Lambda(\tau) = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}} R_\Lambda(m)q^m$$

taking values in the dual space $S_\Lambda^\vee$, whose $m$-th Fourier coefficient $R_\Lambda(m) : S_\Lambda \to \mathbb{C}$ is the representation number

$$R_\Lambda(m,\varphi) = \sum_{\substack{\lambda\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\Lambda \\ \langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle=m}} \varphi(\lambda).$$

We consider the vector variant

$$L(\vec{g},\theta_\Lambda,s) = \Gamma\Big(\frac{s}{2}+n-1\Big)\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}} \frac{\big\{\overline{\vec{a}(m)}, R_\Lambda(m)\big\}}{(4\pi m)^{\frac{s}{2}+n-1}} \tag{1.3.1}$$

of (1.2.1), where the pairing $\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ is the tautological pairing between $S_{\mathscr{L}}$ and $S_{\mathscr{L}}^\vee$, and $R_\Lambda(m)$ is viewed as an element of $S_{\mathscr{L}}^\vee$ using the natural surjection $S_{\mathscr{L}} \to S_\Lambda$. Unlike (1.2.1), the $L$-function (1.3.1) satisfies a simple functional equation in $s \mapsto -s$, which forces $L(\vec{g},\theta_\Lambda,0) = 0$.

Now we turn to the left hand side of (1.2.4). Let $H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})$ be the space of harmonic Maass forms for $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ of weight $2-n$ with values in the vector space $S_{\mathscr{L}}$. There is an arithmetic theta lift of harmonic Maass forms

$$H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^\Delta \longrightarrow \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}{}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}), \tag{1.3.2}$$

denoted $f \mapsto \widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$, whose definition is roughly as follows. There is a theta lift from functions on the upper half plane to functions on the Shimura variety $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$. If one attempts to lift an element $f \in H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})$, the theta integral diverges due to the growth of $f$ at the cusp. There is a natural way to regularize the divergent integral in order to obtain a function $\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ on $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$, but the regularization process introduces singularities into the function $\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$, see [Bo1] and [BF]. These singularities turn out to be of logarithmic type. In fact $\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ is a Green function for a certain divisor $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)(\mathbb{C})$ on $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$, which can be written in an explicit way as a linear combination of the complex Kudla-Rapoport divisors $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})(\mathbb{C})$. As the complex Kudla-Rapoport divisors have canonical extensions to the integral model $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$, we obtain an extension of $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)(\mathbb{C})$ to the integral model as well. The result is a divisor $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ on $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ together with a Green function $\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$. The arithmetic theta lift of $f$ is then defined by first adding boundary components with appropriate multiplicities in order to define a compactified arithmetic divisor

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) \in \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}{}^1(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}),$$

and then adding a certain multiple (depending on the constant term of $f$) of the metrized cotautological bundle $\widehat{\mathtt{T}}^*$ to obtain

$$\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) \in \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}{}^1(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}).$$

There is a surjective complex-conjugate-linear differential operator

$$\xi : H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}}) \longrightarrow S_n(\overline{\omega}_{\mathscr{L}}),$$

introduced in [BF]. We conjecture that (1.3.2) factors through $\xi$, resulting in a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^{\Delta} \arrow[d, "\xi"'] \arrow[dr, "\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}"] & \\
S_n(\Gamma_0(D), \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^n) \arrow[r, "g \mapsto \vec{g}"] & S_n(\overline{\omega}_{\mathscr{L}})^{\Delta} \arrow[r, dashed, "?"'] & \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}_{\mathbb{C}}^1(\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}^*).
\end{tikzcd}$$

Assuming the existence of the dotted arrow, the composition along the bottom row necessarily takes $g$ to (the restriction to $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$ of) the conjectural arithmetic theta lift (1.2.3). Thus we find an obvious way to give an unconditional construction of the class (1.2.3): pick any $f \in H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^{\Delta}$ satisfying $\xi(f) = \vec{g}$, and form the class $\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$. The downside to this roundabout definition is that the construction *a priori* may depend on the choice of $f$ lifting $\vec{g}$. The independence of $\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ of this choice is equivalent to the modularity of the vector valued analogue of the generating series (1.2.2). See Section 8.3 for the precise conjectures.

The following is our main result. It is stated in the text as Theorem 8.2.2.

**Theorem A.** *For any $g \in S_n(\Gamma_0(D), \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^n)$, and any $f \in H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^{\Delta}$ satisfying $\xi(f) = \vec{g}$, we have*

$$[\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)}] = -\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \cdot L'(\vec{g}, \theta_{\Lambda}, 0). \tag{1.3.3}$$

*The constant appearing on the right is*

$$\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} = \sum_{y \in \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})} \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Aut}(y)|}.$$

*An explicit formula for this constant is given in Remark 6.1.4.*

Note that the right hand side of (1.3.3) is visibly independent of the choice of $f$ lifting $\vec{g}$. The following result, which provides evidence for the modularity of (1.2.2), is a formal consequence of this observation together with the modularity criterion of Borcherds [Bo2, Theorem 3.1]. See Theorem 8.3.4 for a slightly stronger statement.

**Theorem B.** *The formal $q$-expansion*

$$\sum_{m \geq 0} [\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(m, \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}) : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] \cdot q^m$$

*defines an element of $M_n(\Gamma_0(D), \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^n)$.*

It remains to explain the relation between the two $L$-functions (1.2.1) and (1.3.1). This is the subject of Section 9. The general relation is rather complicated, but the formulas simplify considerably when $n$ is even and $g$ is a new eigenform, allowing us to restate Theorem A in terms of the original $L$-function (1.2.1).

If $h$ is an element of the unitary similitude group $\mathrm{GU}_{\Lambda}(\widehat{\mathbb{Q}})$ of $\Lambda$, then the $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module $\Lambda_h = (\Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}) \cap h\widehat{\Lambda}$ has a natural self-dual hermitian form. The assignment $h \mapsto \Lambda_h$ defines a map from the 0-dimensional Shimura variety

$$X_{\Lambda} = \mathrm{GU}_{\Lambda}(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash \mathrm{GU}_{\Lambda}(\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}) / \mathrm{GU}_{\Lambda}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$$

to the set of isomorphism classes of self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules of signature $(n-1, 0)$. The group $\mathrm{GU}_{\Lambda}(\widehat{\mathbb{Q}})$ also acts on incoherent self-dual hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-modules of signature

$(1,0)$ through the determinant. It is easily seen that $\mathscr{L}_{0,h} \oplus \Lambda_h \cong \mathscr{L}$ (Lemma 9.1.2), and therefore we may form a new CM cycle $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_{0,h},\Lambda_h)}$ on $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$. Let

$$\eta : X_\Lambda \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}.$$

be an algebraic automorphic form for $\mathrm{GU}_\Lambda$, and assume that $\eta$ transforms under the natural action of the class group $\mathrm{CL}(\boldsymbol{k})$ on $X_\Lambda$ by some character $\chi_\eta : \mathrm{CL}(\boldsymbol{k}) \to \mathbb{C}^\times$. We obtain a cycle

$$\eta\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} = \sum_{h\in X_\Lambda} \eta(h)\cdot \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_{0,h},\Lambda_h)}$$

on $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$ with complex coefficients, and a corresponding scalar valued theta function

$$\theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\eta,\Lambda} = \sum_{h\in X_\Lambda} \frac{\eta(h)}{|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda_h)|}\cdot \theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\Lambda_h} \in M_{n-1}(\Gamma_0(D),\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{n-1}).$$

**Theorem C.** *If $n$ is even and $g$ is new eigenform, then*

$$[\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) : \eta\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] = -\frac{h_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2}{2^{o(d_{\boldsymbol{k}})-1}w_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2}\cdot\frac{d}{ds}\Big[L(g,\theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\eta,\Lambda},s)\cdot\prod_{p\mid D}\big(1+\chi_\eta(\mathfrak{p})\epsilon_p(g)\gamma_p(\mathscr{L})p^{\frac{s}{2}}\big)\Big]\Big|_{s=0}.$$

*for any $f \in H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^\Delta$ with $\xi(f) = \vec{g}$. Here $\mathfrak{p}$ is the unique prime of $\boldsymbol{k}$ above $p$, $\epsilon_p(g) \in \{\pm 1\}$ denotes the eigenvalue for $g$ of the Atkin-Lehner involution at $p$, and*

$$\gamma_p(\mathscr{L}) = (-1)^{\frac{(p-1)n}{4}}\chi_{\boldsymbol{k},p}(\det(\mathscr{L}_p)).$$

*The constants $h_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, $w_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and $o(d_{\boldsymbol{k}})$ are the class number of $\boldsymbol{k}$, the number of roots of unity in $\boldsymbol{k}$. and the number of prime divisors of $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$.*

There is a similar theorem when $n$ is odd, but the result is less elegant. We refer the reader to Theorem 9.3.1 for the general case.

*Remark* 1.3.1. There are corresponding statements for the complementary case when $\mathscr{L}$ is a *coherent* positive definite $(\boldsymbol{k}_\infty,\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module of rank $n$. Then we may choose an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-lattice $L$ whose completion is $\mathscr{L}$, and use the 0-dimensional Shimura variety

$$X_L = \mathrm{GU}_L(\mathbb{Q})\backslash \mathrm{GU}_L(\widehat{\mathbb{Q}})/\mathrm{GU}_L(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$$

as a substitute for $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$. In this case the sign in the functional equation of $L(\vec{g},\theta_\Lambda,s)$ is 1. Moreover, the central value at $s=0$ can be computed by integrating the theta lift of $g$ to $X_L$ over a certain cycle of CM points determined by $\Lambda$. We intend to elaborate on this in a separate paper.

1.4. **Outline of the paper.** Section 2 is a rapid review of definitions. We first recall the invariants attached to hermitian spaces, and introduce the notion of coherent and incoherent hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}},\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-modules. Then we recall various standard definitions and properties of Siegel theta functions, vector-valued modular forms, harmonic Maass forms, and the differential operator $\xi$ introduced in [BF].

In Section 3 we introduce the complex fiber of the unitary Shimura variety on which we will be working, and its special divisors. In particular we attach a divisor $Z(f)$ to a harmonic Maass form, and explain how the mechanism of *regularized theta lifts* equips this divisor with a natural Green function $\Phi(f)$. We show that $\Phi(f)$ is (sub-)harmonic and satisfies an integrability condition. These properties, together with the logarithmic singularity along $Z(f)$, characterize it uniquely up to an additive constant. One of the minor miracles of the construction of $\Phi(f)$ is that, despite having a logarithmic singularity along $Z(f)$, it is defined at *every* point of the complex Shimura variety. Expressed differently, the smooth function $\Phi(f)$, initially defined on the complement of $Z(f)$, has a natural (discontinuous) extension to all points. The behavior of $\Phi(f)$ at the points of $Z(f)$, described in Corollary 3.3.2, plays an essential role in the calculation of the improper intersections needed to prove Theorem A.

Section 4 first recalls the construction of the canonical smooth toroidal compactification of the complex Shimura variety. What is new is the analysis of the behavior of the Green function $\Phi(f)$ near the boundary of the compactification. We find that one can compactify the divisor $Z(f)$ by adding a prescribed linear combination of boundary components, in such a way that $\Phi(f)$ is a Green function for the compactified divisor (at least up to negligible log-log error terms). The multiplicities of the boundary components are given by regularized integrals of $f$ against theta functions of positive definite hermitian lattices of rank $n-2$, see Theorem 4.3.3. A similar result was proved in [Ho3], but for *different* Green functions. The method used here, based on the calculation of Fourier-Jacobi expansions (Theorem 4.4.2), is unrelated. Because these results are of independent interest, in Sections 3 and 4 we work on Shimura varieties with arbitrary level structure; this is more generality than is needed in the rest of the paper.

Section 5 introduces the integral model $\mathtt{M}$ of the Shimura variety, the Kudla-Rapoport divisors $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})$, and the cycle of CM points $\mathtt{Y}_\Lambda$. Section 5.3 contains the first steps toward the intersection theory calculation lying at the heart of Theorem A. Roughly speaking, we show that the intersection $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})\cap\mathtt{Y}_\Lambda$ decomposes as a disjoint union of stacks $\mathtt{X}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r})$ indexed by pairs of nonnegative integers $(m_1,m_2)$ with $m_1+m_2=m$. If $m_1>0$ then the stack $\mathtt{X}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r})$ has dimension 0 and is supported in a single nonzero characteristic. Theorem 5.3.2 gives an explicit formula for the degree of this 0-dimensional stack. The calculation of the lengths of its local rings ultimately reduces to the calculations performed by Gross [Gr] as part of the proof of the original Gross-Zagier theorem. In contrast, the stack $\mathtt{X}(0,m,\mathfrak{r})$ has dimension 1, and appears because of improper intersection between $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})$ and $\mathtt{Y}_\Lambda$.

In Section 6 we describe the complex uniformizations of the stacks $\mathtt{M}$, $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})$ and $\mathtt{Y}_\Lambda$, and then apply the general theory of Section 3 in order to attach an arithmetic cycle class $(\mathtt{Z}(f),\Phi(f))$ on $\mathtt{M}$ to a harmonic Maass form $f$ of weight $2-n$. Particular choices $f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ yield Green functions for the divisors $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})$. The main result of Section 6, Theorem 6.4.1, is a formula for the value of the Green function $\Phi(f)$ on the CM cycle $\mathtt{Y}_\Lambda(\mathbb{C})$. When combined with the finite intersection calculation of Theorem 5.3.2, this archimedean calculation (with $f=f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$) is sufficient to compute the intersection multiplicity $[\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}(m,\mathfrak{r}):\mathtt{Y}_\Lambda]$, at least when the cycles in question intersect properly. Unfortunately, this happens only very rarely.

Most of Section 7 is devoted to the calculation of improper intersections. Calculations of improper intersection have been done in other situations elsewhere in the literature (for example in [GZ], [KRY2], [Ho1]), but our methods are new, and are the most original contribution of this paper. In both [KRY2] and [Ho1] the method of computation is to decompose the cycles into irreducible components and painstakingly intersect these components one at a time, using some form of adjunction formula, in order to obtain an explicit formula for the intersection. Our method also uses a kind of adjunction formula, but we do not know, and never need to know, what the irreducible components of our cycles look like. In particular, we do not need to compute the multiplicities of vertical components of the divisors $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})$, and in fact we don't know whether or not such vertical components exist. Instead of explicit calculation, we use deformation theory to show that a certain metrized line bundle

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\heartsuit}(m,\mathfrak{r}) = \widehat{\mathtt{Z}}(m,\mathfrak{r}) \otimes \widehat{\mathtt{T}}^{-R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})}$$

on $\mathtt{M}$ acquires a canonical nonzero section $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ when restricted to $\mathtt{Y}_\Lambda$. To compute the intersection multiplicity $[\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\heartsuit}(m,\mathfrak{r}) : \mathtt{Y}_\Lambda]$ it suffices to compute the degree of the 0-cycle $\mathrm{div}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}})$ on $\mathtt{Y}_\Lambda$, and the norm $||\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}||_y$ at each $y \in \mathtt{Y}_\Lambda$. The divisor $\mathrm{div}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}})$ turns out to be exactly the divisor obtained by intersecting $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r}) \cap \mathtt{Y}_\Lambda$ and then throwing away all components of the intersection having dimension $> 0$. In other words, it is the proper part of the intersection, and was computed in Theorem 5.3.2. The norm $||\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}||_y$ turns out to be the value of the Green function for $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})$ at $y$ (even when $y$ lies on $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})$, the singularity of the Green function!), which was computed in Theorem 6.4.1. Thus we are able to compute

$$[\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}(m,\mathfrak{r}) : \mathtt{Y}_\Lambda] = [\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\heartsuit}(m,\mathfrak{r}) : \mathtt{Y}_\Lambda] + R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})[\widehat{\mathtt{T}} : \mathtt{Y}_\Lambda]$$

by computing only proper intersections, the CM values of Green functions, and the intersection $[\widehat{\mathtt{T}} : \mathtt{Y}_\Lambda]$. The Chowla-Selberg formula allows us to give an explicit formula for $[\widehat{\mathtt{T}} : \mathtt{Y}_\Lambda]$, and putting these formulas together relates $[\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}(m,\mathfrak{r}) : \mathtt{Y}_\Lambda]$ to the derivative of $L(\xi(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}), \theta_\Lambda, s)$. The precise formula is found in Theorem 7.3.1, the preliminary form of our main result.

Section 8 puts all of the pieces together to prove Theorems A and B. Section 9 explains the precise relation between the $L$-functions (1.2.1) and (1.3.1), and completes the proof of Theorem C.

1.5. **Notation and terminology.** We write $\mathbb{H}$ for the complex upper half plane. For a complex number $z$ we put $e(z) = e^{2\pi i z}$. As usual, we denote by $\mathbb{A}$ the ring of adeles of $\mathbb{Q}$ and write $\mathbb{A}_f$ for the finite adeles.

The quadratic imaginary field $\boldsymbol{k}$ and its embedding $\boldsymbol{k} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are fixed throughout the paper, and $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ and $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ denote the different and discriminant of $\boldsymbol{k}$. In Sections 2 through 4 we make no restriction on $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, but beginning in Section 5, and continuing until the end of the paper, we assume that $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is odd. We write $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ and $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k},f}$ for the ring of integers, adeles, and finite adeles of $\boldsymbol{k}$, respectively. The class number of $\boldsymbol{k}$ is $h_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and $w_{\boldsymbol{k}} = |\mu(\boldsymbol{k})|$ is the number of roots of unity in $\boldsymbol{k}$. Denote by $o(d_{\boldsymbol{k}})$ the number of distinct prime divisors of $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and by

$$\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}} : \mathbb{A}^\times \longrightarrow \{\pm 1\}$$

the quadratic character determined by the extension $\boldsymbol{k}/\mathbb{Q}$. For any $m \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ define

$$\rho(m) = |\{\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} : \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{b}) = m\}|. \tag{1.5.1}$$

Obviously $\rho(m) = 0$ unless $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Abbreviate $\boldsymbol{k}_\mathbb{R} = \boldsymbol{k} \otimes_\mathbb{Q} \mathbb{R}$. Of course the fixed embedding of $\boldsymbol{k}$ into $\mathbb{C}$ identifies $\boldsymbol{k}_\mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{C}$, but there will be moments (in Section 6.1, for example) when we consider a finite dimensional $\boldsymbol{k}_\mathbb{R}$-module with a varying family of complex structures, and so it will be useful sometimes to not make this identification.

## 2. Preliminaries

This section contains some basic definitions and notation concerning hermitian spaces, theta series, and vector valued modular forms.

2.1. **Invariants of hermitian spaces.** A *hermitian* $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$*-module* is a projective $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module $L$ of finite rank equipped with a hermitian form $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle : L\times L\to\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. Our convention is that hermitian forms are $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-linear in the first variable and $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-conjugate-linear in the second variable. All hermitian forms are assumed to be nondegenerate. For an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-ideal $\mathfrak{r}\mid\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, every vector $x\in\mathfrak{r}^{-1}L$ satisfies

$$\langle x,x\rangle\in\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r})^{-1}\mathbb{Z}, \tag{2.1.1}$$

and $Q(x)=\langle x,x\rangle$ defines a $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z}$-valued quadratic form on $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}L/L$. A hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module $L$ is *self-dual* if it satisfies

$$L=\{x\in L\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{Q} : \langle x,L\rangle\subset\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\}.$$

We can similarly talk about self-dual hermitian $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules, and hermitian spaces over $\boldsymbol{k}$, over its completions, and over $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$.

If $\mathfrak{A}_0$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ are hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules with hermitian forms $h_{\mathfrak{A}_0}$ and $h_{\mathfrak{A}}$, the $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module

$$L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})=\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}) \tag{2.1.2}$$

carries a hermitian form $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ determined by the relation

$$\langle f,g\rangle\cdot h_{\mathfrak{A}_0}(x,y)=h_{\mathfrak{A}}(f(x),g(y))$$

for all $x,y\in\mathfrak{A}_0$. If $\mathfrak{A}_0$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ are self-dual then so is $L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})$. Of course a similar discussion holds for hermitian $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules.

A hermitian space $\mathscr{V}$ over $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ has an archimedean part $\mathscr{V}_\infty$ and a nonarchimedean part $\mathscr{V}_f=\prod_p\mathscr{V}_p$, which are hermitian spaces over $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k},f}$, respectively. The archimedean part is uniquely determined by its signature, while each factor $\mathscr{V}_p$ is uniquely determined by its dimension and the *local invariant*

$$\mathrm{inv}_p(\mathscr{V})=\chi_{\boldsymbol{k},p}(\det(\mathscr{V}_p))\in\{\pm1\}.$$

Of course the invariant is also defined for $p=\infty$, but carries less information than the signature. The *invariant* of $\mathscr{V}$ is the product of local invariants:

$$\mathrm{inv}(\mathscr{V})=\prod_{p\le\infty}\mathrm{inv}_p(\mathscr{V}).$$

If $\mathrm{inv}(\mathscr{V})=1$ then there is a hermitian space $V$ over $\boldsymbol{k}$, unique up to isomorphism, satisfying $\mathscr{V}\cong V\otimes_{\mathbb{Q}}\mathbb{A}$. In this case we say that $\mathscr{V}$ is *coherent*. If instead $\mathrm{inv}(\mathscr{V})=-1$ then no such $V$ exists, and we say that $\mathscr{V}$ is *incoherent*.

We will need a notion of a hermitian space over $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ with an integral structure.

**Definition 2.1.1.** A *hermitian* $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}},\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$*-module* is a hermitian space $\mathscr{V}$ over $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ together with a finitely generated $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-submodule $\mathscr{L}_f\subset\mathscr{V}_f$ of maximal rank on which the hermitian form is $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-valued. Equivalently, a *hermitian* $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}},\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$*-module* is a pair $\mathscr{L}=(\mathscr{L}_\infty,\mathscr{L}_f)$, in which $\mathscr{L}_\infty$ is a hermitian space over $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$, and $\mathscr{L}_f=\prod_p\mathscr{L}_p$ is a hermitian space over $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ of the same rank as $\mathscr{L}_\infty$. One recovers the first definition from the second by setting $\mathscr{V}_\infty=\mathscr{L}_\infty$ and $\mathscr{V}_f=\mathscr{L}_f\otimes_{\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}}\mathbb{A}_f$.

1. The *signature* of a hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}},\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L}$ is the signature of $\mathscr{L}_\infty$,
2. $\mathscr{L}$ is *self-dual* if $\mathscr{L}_f$ is a self-dual hermitian $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module in the above sense,
3. $\mathscr{L}$ is *coherent* (or *incoherent*) if $\mathscr{V}$ is.

Obviously, every hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module $L$ gives rise to a coherent hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L}$ determined by $\mathscr{L}_\infty = L \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathscr{L}_f = L \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$. Conversely, for each hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L}$ there is a finite collection of hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules that give rise to it. This finite collection is the *genus of* $\mathscr{L}$, and is denoted

$$\mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{isomorphism classes of} \\ \text{hermitian } \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\text{-modules } L \end{array} : \begin{array}{c} \mathscr{L}_\infty \cong L \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} \\ \mathscr{L}_f \cong L \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \widehat{\mathbb{Z}} \end{array} \right\}.$$

The genus is nonempty if and only if $\mathscr{L}$ is coherent, and any two $L, L' \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L})$ satisfy $L \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q} \cong L' \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ as hermitian spaces over $\boldsymbol{k}$.

*Remark* 2.1.2. Given a hermitian space $\mathscr{V}$ over $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ and a rational prime $p$ nonsplit in $\boldsymbol{k}$, there is a *nearby* hermitian space $\mathscr{V}(p)$ over $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, uniquely determined (up to isomorphism) by the properties

(1) $\mathscr{V}(p)_\ell \cong \mathscr{V}_\ell$ for every place $\ell \neq p$,
(2) $\mathscr{V}(p)_p \ncong \mathscr{V}_p$.

In other words, $\mathscr{V}(p)$ is obtained from $\mathscr{V}$ by changing the local invariant at $p$, and so

$$\mathrm{inv}(\mathscr{V}(p)) = -\mathrm{inv}(\mathscr{V}).$$

If instead we take $p = \infty$ then there is no single notion of $\mathscr{V}(\infty)$. However, in the applications we have in mind $\mathscr{V}$ will be positive definite, and $\mathscr{V}(\infty)$ will be obtained from $\mathscr{V}$ by switching the signature from $(n, 0)$ to $(n-1, 1)$.

2.2. **Theta functions and vector valued modular forms.** Let $(M, Q)$ be an even integral lattice, that is, a free $\mathbb{Z}$-module of finite rank equipped with a non-degenerate $\mathbb{Z}$-valued quadratic form $Q$. For simplicity we assume here that the rank of $M$ is even. We denote the signature of $M$ by $(b^+, b^-)$. Let $M'$ be the dual lattice of $M$. The quadratic form $Q$ induces a $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$-valued quadratic form on the discriminant group $M'/M$.

Let $\omega$ be the restriction to $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ of the Weil representation of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\widehat{\mathbb{Q}})$ (associated with the standard additive character of $\mathbb{A}/\mathbb{Q}$) on the Schwartz-Bruhat functions on $M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \widehat{\mathbb{Q}}$. The restriction of $\omega$ to $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ takes the subspace $S_M$ of Schwartz-Bruhat functions which are supported on $\widehat{M}'$ and invariant under translations by $\widehat{M}$ to itself. We obtain a representation $\omega_M : \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \to \mathrm{Aut}(S_M)$. Throughout we identify $S_M$ with the space of functions $M'/M \to \mathbb{C}$. Let $S_M^\vee$ be the dual space of $S_M$, and denote by

$$\{\cdot, \cdot\} : S_M \times S_M^\vee \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

the tautological $\mathbb{C}$-bilinear pairing. The group $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ acts on $S_M^\vee$ through the dual representation $\omega_M^\vee$, given by $\omega_M^\vee(\gamma)(f) = f \circ \omega_M^{-1}(\gamma)$ for $f \in S_M^\vee$. On the space $S_M$ we also have the conjugate representation $\bar\omega_M$ given by

$$\bar\omega_M(\gamma)(\varphi) = \overline{\omega_M(\gamma)(\bar\varphi)}$$

for $\varphi \in S_M$. Note that $\bar\omega_M$ is the representation denoted $\rho_M$ in [Bo1], [Br1], [BF]. The same construction can also be applied in slightly greater generality. For instance, in later applications we will use it when $M$ is a quadratic module over $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Let $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$ be the Grassmannian of negative definite $b^-$-dimensional subspaces of $M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. For $z \in \mathrm{Gr}(M)$ and $\lambda \in M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $\lambda_z$ and $\lambda_{z^\perp}$ the orthogonal projection of $\lambda$ to $z$ and $z^\perp$, respectively. If $\varphi \in S_M$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{H}$, we let

$$\Theta_M(\tau, z, \varphi) = v^{b^-/2} \sum_{\lambda \in M'} \varphi(\lambda) e\big(Q(\lambda_{z^\perp})\tau + Q(\lambda_z)\bar\tau\big) \tag{2.2.1}$$

be the associated Siegel theta function. For $\gamma \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ it satisfies the transformation law

$$\Theta_M(\gamma\tau, z, \varphi) = (c\tau + d)^{\frac{b^+ - b^-}{2}} \Theta_M(\tau, z, \omega_M(\gamma)\varphi).$$

Following [Ku3], we view the Siegel theta function as a function

$$\mathbb{H} \times \mathrm{Gr}(M) \longrightarrow S_M^\vee, \quad (\tau, z) \mapsto \Theta_M(\tau, z).$$

The above transformation law implies that $\Theta_M(\tau, z)$ is a (non-holomorphic) modular form of weight $(b^+ - b^-)/2$ for the group $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ with values in $S_M^\vee$.

Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and let $\sigma$ be a finite dimensional representation of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ on a complex vector space $V_\sigma$, which factors through a finite quotient of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. We denote by $H_k(\sigma)$ the vector space of harmonic Maass forms[1] of weight $k$ for the group $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ with representation $\sigma$ as in [BY]. We write $M_k^!(\sigma)$, $M_k(\sigma)$, and $S_k(\sigma)$ for the subspaces of weakly holomorphic modular forms, holomorphic modular forms, and cusp forms, respectively. The natural action of the orthogonal group of $M$ on the space $S_M$ commutes with the action of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. Hence there is an induced action on the above spaces of vector valued modular forms.

A harmonic Maass form $f \in H_k(\sigma)$ has a Fourier expansion of the form

$$f(\tau) = \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{Q} \\ m \geq m_0}} c^+(m) q^m + \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{Q} \\ m < 0}} c^-(m) \Gamma(1 - k, 4\pi |m| v) q^m \tag{2.2.2}$$

with Fourier coefficients $c^\pm(m) \in V_\sigma$. Here $v = \mathrm{Im}(\tau)$, $q = e^{2\pi i \tau}$, and $\Gamma(s, x) = \int_x^\infty e^{-t} t^{s-1} dt$ denotes the incomplete gamma function. The coefficients are supported on rational numbers with bounded denominator. The first summand on the right hand side of (2.2.2) is denoted by $f^+$ and is called the *holomorphic part* of $f$, the second summand is denoted by $f^-$ and is called the *non-holomorphic part.*

Recall from [BF] that there is a conjugate-linear differential operator $\xi_k : H_k(\omega_M) \to S_{2-k}(\bar{\omega}_M)$ given by

$$\xi_k(f)(\tau) = 2iv^k \overline{\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{\tau}}}. \tag{2.2.3}$$

The kernel of $\xi_k$ is equal to $M_k^!(\omega_M)$. According to [BF, Corollary 3.8], we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & M_k^!(\omega_M) \arrow[r] & H_k(\omega_M) \arrow[r, "\xi_k"] & S_{2-k}(\bar{\omega}_M) \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}. \tag{2.2.4}$$

If $f \in H_k(\omega_M)$ with Fourier coefficients $c^\pm(m) \in S_M$ as in (2.2.2) and if $\mu \in M'/M$, we put $c^\pm(m, \mu) = c^\pm(m)(\mu) \in \mathbb{C}$.

## 3. Shimura varieties and their divisors

In this section we consider the analytic theory of Shimura varieties associated to hermitian spaces of signature $(n-1, 1)$ over imaginary quadratic fields. We also study their special divisors and automorphic Green functions for special divisors.

Let $V$ be a hermitian space over $\boldsymbol{k}$ equipped with a hermitian form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Throughout we let $V_\mathbb{R} = V \otimes_\mathbb{Q} \mathbb{R}$ and assume that the signature of $V$ is $(n-1, 1)$. We write $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\mathbb{Q}$ for the symmetric bilinear form $\langle x, y \rangle_\mathbb{Q} = \mathrm{tr}_{\boldsymbol{k}/\mathbb{Q}} \langle x, y \rangle$. The associated quadratic form over $\mathbb{Q}$ is $Q(x) = \frac{1}{2}\langle x, x \rangle_\mathbb{Q} = \langle x, x \rangle$. Note that the Weil representations of $\mathrm{SL}_2 \subset \mathrm{U}(1,1)$ associated to the quadratic form over $\mathbb{Q}$ and the hermitian form are the same.

---

[1] For ease of notation we drop the adjective 'weak' in *harmonic weak Maass form.*

3.1. **Hermitian spaces and unitary Shimura varieties.** We realize the hermitian symmetric space associated to the unitary group $\mathrm{U}(V)$ as the Grassmannian $\mathcal{D}$ of negative $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$-lines in $V_{\mathbb{R}}$. It can be viewed as an open subset of the projective space $\mathbb{P}(V_{\mathbb{R}})$ of the complex vector space $V_{\mathbb{R}}$. The domain $\mathcal{D}$ is not a tube domain unless $n = 2$, in which case it is isomorphic to the complex upper half plane $\mathbb{H}$. In general, $\mathcal{D}$ has a realization as a Siegel domain as follows.

Let $\ell \in V$ be a nonzero isotropic vector and let $\tilde{\ell} \in V$ be isotropic such that $\langle \ell, \tilde{\ell} \rangle = 1$. The orthogonal complement

$$W = \ell^{\perp} \cap \tilde{\ell}^{\perp}$$

is a positive definite hermitian space over $\boldsymbol{k}$ of dimension $n-2$, and we have $V = W \oplus \boldsymbol{k}\ell \oplus \boldsymbol{k}\tilde{\ell}$. If $z \in \mathcal{D}$, then $\langle z, \ell \rangle \neq 0$. Hence $z$ has a unique basis vector of the form

$$\mathfrak{z} + \tau\sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\ell + \tilde{\ell}$$

with $\mathfrak{z} \in W_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{C}$. We denote this vector by the pair $(\mathfrak{z}, \tau)$. The condition that the restriction of the hermitian form to $z$ is negative definite is equivalent to requiring that

$$\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z}, \tau) = -\langle (\mathfrak{z}, \tau), (\mathfrak{z}, \tau) \rangle = 2\sqrt{|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|}\,\mathrm{Im}(\tau) - \langle \mathfrak{z}, \mathfrak{z} \rangle \tag{3.1.1}$$

is positive. Consequently, $\mathcal{D}$ is isomorphic to

$$\mathcal{H}_{\ell,\tilde{\ell}} = \{(\mathfrak{z}, \tau) \in W_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{H} : \quad 2\sqrt{|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|}\,\mathrm{Im}(\tau) > \langle \mathfrak{z}, \mathfrak{z} \rangle\}.$$

For $z \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\lambda \in V_{\mathbb{R}}$ we let $\lambda_{z^{\perp}}$ and $\lambda_z$ be the orthogonal projections of $\lambda$ to $z^{\perp}$ and $z$, respectively. Then the majorant

$$\langle \lambda, \mu \rangle_z = \langle \lambda_{z^{\perp}}, \mu_{z^{\perp}} \rangle - \langle \lambda_z, \mu_z \rangle$$

associated to $z$ defines a positive definite hermitian form on $V_{\mathbb{R}}$. If $0 \neq z_0 \in z$, we have

$$\langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle_z = \langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle + 2\frac{|\langle \lambda, z_0 \rangle|^2}{|\langle z_0, z_0 \rangle|}.$$

The hermitian domain $\mathcal{D}$ carries over it a *tautological bundle* $\mathcal{L}$, whose fiber at the point $z \in \mathcal{D}$ is the negative line $z$. The hermitian form on $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ induces a hermitian metric on $\mathcal{L}$. Its first Chern form $\Omega$ is $\mathrm{U}(V)(\mathbb{R})$-invariant and positive. It corresponds to an invariant Kähler metric on $\mathcal{D}$ and gives rise to an invariant volume form $d\mu(z) = \Omega^{n-1}$. In the coordinates of $\mathcal{H}_{\ell,\tilde{\ell}}$ we have

$$\Omega = -dd^c \log \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z}, \tau). \tag{3.1.2}$$

Let $L \subset V$ be an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-lattice, that is, a finitely generated $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-submodule such that $V = L \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \boldsymbol{k}$ and such that the restriction of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ to $L$ takes values in $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}$. With the quadratic form $Q(x) = \langle x, x \rangle$, we may also view $L$ as a lattice over $\mathbb{Z}$. Throughout we assume that $L$ is even as a lattice over $\mathbb{Z}$, that is, $\langle x, x \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $x \in L$. This condition is automatically fulfilled if the hermitian form on $L$ takes values in $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. Let

$$L' = \{x \in V : \langle x, y \rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for all } y \in L\},$$
$$L'_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} = \{x \in V : \langle x, y \rangle \in \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \text{ for all } y \in L\}$$

be the $\mathbb{Z}$-dual and the $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-dual of $L$, respectively. We have that $L' = \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1} L'_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \supset L$.

Let $\Gamma$ be a finite index subgroup of the unitary group $\mathrm{U}(L)$ of $L$. The quotient

$$X_{\Gamma} = \Gamma \backslash \mathcal{D}.$$

is a complex orbifold of dimension $n-1$. It can be viewed as the complex points of a connected component of a Shimura variety. It is compact if and only if $V$ is anisotropic. In particular, if $n>2$, then $X_\Gamma$ is non-compact. We define the volume of $X_\Gamma$ by $\operatorname{vol}(X_\Gamma)=\int_{X_\Gamma}\Omega^{n-1}$ and the degree of a divisor $Z$ on $X_\Gamma$ by

$$\deg(Z)=\int_Z \Omega^{n-2}. \tag{3.1.3}$$

3.2. **Special divisors.** For any vector $\lambda\in V$ of positive norm we put

$$\mathcal{D}(\lambda)=\{z\in\mathcal{D}:\ \langle z,\lambda\rangle=0\}.$$

Let $S_L$ be the complex vector space of functions $L'/L\to\mathbb{C}$. In the spirit of [Ku2], for $\varphi\in S_L$ and $m\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ we define the special divisor

$$Z(m,\varphi)=\sum_{\substack{\lambda\in L'\\ \langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle=m}}\varphi(\lambda)\mathcal{D}(\lambda).$$

We write $Z(m)$ for the element of

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(S_L,\operatorname{Div}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{D}))\cong\operatorname{Div}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{D})\otimes_{\mathbb{C}}S_L^\vee$$

given by $\varphi\mapsto Z(m,\varphi)$. If $\varphi$ is invariant under $\Gamma$, then $Z(m,\varphi)$ is a $\Gamma$-invariant divisor and descends to a divisor on the quotient $X_\Gamma$, which we will also denote by $Z(m,\varphi)$.

3.3. **Regularized theta lifts.** In this subsection we define automorphic Green functions for special divisors as regularized theta lifts of harmonic Maass forms.

We use $\tau$ as a standard variable in the upper half plane $\mathbb{H}$, and put $u=\operatorname{Re}(\tau)$, $v=\operatorname{Im}(\tau)$. The $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-lattice $L$ together with the symmetric bilinear form $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an even $\mathbb{Z}$-lattice of signature $(2n-2,2)$. Let $\omega_L$ be the corresponding Weil representation on $S_L$ as in Section 2. For $z\in\mathcal{D}$, the Siegel theta function $\Theta_L(\tau,z)$ is a non-holomorphic modular form of weight $n-2$ for $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ with representation $\omega_L^\vee$.

Let $f\in H_{2-n}(\omega_L)$, and denote its Fourier coefficients by $c^\pm(m)\in S_L$ as in (2.2.2). The pairing $\{f,\Theta_L(\tau,z)\}$ is a function on $\mathbb{H}$, which is invariant under $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. Following [Bo1] and [BF], we consider the regularized theta lift

$$\Phi(z,f)=\int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}}^{\mathrm{reg}}\{f,\Theta_L(\tau,z)\}d\mu(\tau) \tag{3.3.1}$$

of $f$, where $d\mu(\tau)=\frac{du\,dv}{v^2}$ is the invariant measure. The integral is regularized by taking the constant term in the Laurent expansion at $s=0$ of the meromorphic continuation of

$$\Phi(z,f,s)=\lim_{T\to\infty}\int_{\mathcal{F}_T}\{f,\Theta_L(\tau,z)\}v^{-s}d\mu(\tau). \tag{3.3.2}$$

Here $\mathcal{F}_T$ denotes the standard fundamental domain for $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ truncated at height $T$. If $\operatorname{Re}(s)>0$, the limit exists and defines a smooth function in $z$ on all of $\mathcal{D}$, which is invariant under the action of $\Gamma$ if $f$ is invariant under $\Gamma$. It has a meromorphic continuation in $s$ to $\mathbb{C}$, see [Bo1], [BF]. The function $\Phi(z,f)$ is defined on all of $\mathcal{D}$ (!), but it is only smooth on the complement of the divisor

$$Z(f)=\sum_{m>0}\{c^+(-m),Z(m)\}. \tag{3.3.3}$$

To describe the behavior near this divisor, we extend the incomplete Gamma function $\Gamma(0,t)=\int_t^\infty e^{-v}\frac{dv}{v}$ to a function on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by defining it as the constant term in the Laurent expansion at $s = 0$ of the meromorphic continuation of $\Gamma(s,t) = \int_t^\infty e^{-v} v^s \frac{dv}{v}$. Hence we have

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(0,t) = \begin{cases} \Gamma(0,t), & \text{if } t > 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } t = 0. \end{cases}$$

The following result is a slight strengthening of [Bo1, Theorem 6.2] in our setting.

**Theorem 3.3.1.** *For any $z_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ there exists a neighborhood $U \subset \mathcal{D}$ such that the function*

$$\Phi(z,f) - \sum_{\lambda \in L' \cap z_0^\perp} c^+(-\langle \lambda, \lambda\rangle, \lambda) \tilde{\Gamma}(0, 4\pi |\langle \lambda_z, \lambda_z \rangle|)$$

*is smooth on $U$. Here $c^+(m,\lambda)$ stands for the value $c^+(m)(\lambda)$ of $c^+(m)$ at $\lambda + L$.*

*Proof.* We begin by noticing that $L' \cap z_0^\perp$ is a positive definite $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module of rank $\le n-1$. Hence the sum on the right hand side is finite.

Arguing as in the proof of [Bo1, Theorem 6.2] (see also [Br1, Theorem 2.12]), we see that there exists a small neighborhood $U \subset \mathcal{D}$ of $z_0$ on which the function

$$\Phi(z,f) - \sum_{\lambda \in L' \cap z_0^\perp} c^+(-\langle \lambda, \lambda\rangle, \lambda)\, \mathrm{CT}_{s=0} \left[ \int_{v=1}^\infty e^{4\pi \langle \lambda_z, \lambda_z\rangle v} v^{-s-1}\, dv \right]$$

is smooth. Here $\mathrm{CT}_{s=0}[\cdot]$ denotes the constant term in the Laurent expansion in $s$ at 0. Inserting the definition of $\tilde{\Gamma}(0,t)$ we obtain the assertion. □

**Corollary 3.3.2.** *For any $z_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ we have*

$$\Phi(z_0, f) = \lim_{\substack{z \to z_0 \\ z \notin Z(f)}} \left[ \Phi(z,f) + \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in L' \cap z_0^\perp \\ \lambda \neq 0}} c^+(-\langle \lambda, \lambda\rangle, \lambda)(\log(4\pi |\langle \lambda_z, \lambda_z\rangle|) - \Gamma'(1)) \right].$$

*Proof.* Using the fact that $\Gamma(0,t) = -\log(t) + \Gamma'(1) + o(t)$ as $t \to \infty$, the corollary follows from Theorem 3.3.1. □

By a *Green function* for a divisor $D$ on a complex manifold $X$ we mean a smooth function $G$ on $X \smallsetminus D$ with the property that for every point $z_0 \in X$ there is a neighborhood $U$ and a local equation $\phi$ for $D$ on $U$ such that $G + \log|\phi|^2$ extends to a smooth function on all of $U$. Using this definition, we may rephrase Theorem 3.3.1 and the corollary by saying that $\Phi(z,f)$ is a Green function for $Z(f)$. In fact, the difference of $\log|\langle \lambda_z, \lambda_z\rangle|$ and $\log|\phi_\lambda|^2$ for any local equation $\phi_\lambda = 0$ of $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)$ extends to a smooth function. In the next section we will study the growth of $\Phi(z,f)$ at the boundary of a toroidal compactifaction of $X_\Gamma$ and show that it can also be considered as a Green function for a suitably 'compactified' divisor there.

Corollary 3.3.2 will be used in Section 7.5 together with Theorem 6.4.1 to compute the height pairing of a hermitian line bundle corresponding to an arithmetic Kudla-Rapoport divisor with a CM cycle.

**Proposition 3.3.3.** *Let $\Delta_{\mathcal{D}}$ be the $\mathrm{U}(V)(\mathbb{R})$-invariant Laplacian on $\mathcal{D}$. There exists a non-zero real constant $c$ (which only depends on the normalization of $\Delta_{\mathcal{D}}$ and which is independent of $f$), such that*

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{D}} \Phi(z,f) = c \cdot \deg Z(f).$$

*Proof.* This can be proved in the same way as [Br1, Theorem 4.7]. □

**Proposition 3.3.4.** *Let $f \in H_{2-n}(\omega_L)$ be $\Gamma$-invariant. If $n > 2$, then the Green function $\Phi(z, f)$ belongs to $L^p(X_\Gamma, \Omega^{n-1})$ for every $p < 2$. If $n > 3$, then $\Phi(z, f)$ belongs to $L^2(X_\Gamma, \Omega^{n-1})$.*

We will prove this Proposition at the end of Section 4.3.

**Theorem 3.3.5.** *Assume that $n > 2$ and that $f \in H_{2-n}(\omega_L)$ is $\Gamma$-invariant. Let $G$ be a smooth real valued function on $X_\Gamma \smallsetminus Z(f)$ with the properties:*

(i) *$G$ is a Green function for $Z(f)$,*
(ii) *$\Delta_{\mathcal{D}} G =$ constant,*
(iii) *$G \in L^{1+\varepsilon}(X_\Gamma, \Omega^{n-1})$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$.*

*Then $G(z)$ differs from $\Phi(z, f)$ by a constant.*

*Proof.* The difference $G(z) - \Phi(z, f)$ is a smooth subharmonic function on the complete Riemann manifold $X_\Gamma$ which is contained in $L^{1+\varepsilon}(X_\Gamma, \Omega^{n-1})$. By a result of Yau, such a function must be constant (see e.g. [Br1, Corollary 4.22]). □

For $n = 2$ one can obtain a similar characterization by also requiring growth conditions at the cusps of $X_\Gamma$ (if there are any).

## 4. Green functions on toroidal compactifications

As in Section 3, let $V$ be a hermitian space over $\boldsymbol{k}$ of signature $(n-1, 1)$. In the present section we study the behavior of the automorphic Green function $\Phi(z, f)$ at the boundary of a toroidal compactification. We show that it is a log-log Green function in the sense of [BKK] for the divisor $Z(f) + B(f)$, where $B(f)$ is a certain linear combination of boundary divisors. We show that the multiplicities of the boundary divisors are given by regularized theta lifts of the harmonic Maass form $f$ to positive definite quadratic spaces of signature $(n-2, 0)$. To this end we compute the Fourier-Jacobi expansion of $\Phi(z, f)$ and analyze the different terms at the boundary.

4.1. **The toroidal compactification.** The complex space $X_\Gamma = \Gamma \backslash \mathcal{D}$ can be compactified as follows. Let $\operatorname{Iso}(V)$ be the set of isotropic one-dimensional subspaces $I \subset V$. The group $\Gamma$ acts on $\operatorname{Iso}(V)$ with finitely many orbits. The rational boundary point corresponding to $I \in \operatorname{Iso}(V)$, is the point $I_\mathbb{R} = I \otimes_\mathbb{Q} \mathbb{R} \in \mathbb{P}(V_\mathbb{R})$. It lies in the closure of $\mathcal{D}$ in $\mathbb{P}(V_\mathbb{R})$. The Baily-Borel compactification of $X_\Gamma$ is obtained by equipping the quotient

$$\Gamma \backslash \big( \mathcal{D} \cup \{ I_\mathbb{R} :\ I \in \operatorname{Iso}(V) \} \big)$$

with the Baily-Borel topology and complex structure. However, the boundary points are usually singular.

In contrast, here we work with a canonical toroidal compactification of $X_\Gamma$, which we now describe, see also [Hof, Chapter 1.1.5] and [Ho3, Section 3.3]. It can be viewed as a resolution of the singularities at the boundary points of the Baily-Borel compactification.

Let $I \in \operatorname{Iso}(V)$ be a one-dimensional isotropic subspace. Let $\ell \in I$ be a generator, and let $\tilde{\ell} \in V$ be isotropic such that $\langle \ell, \tilde{\ell} \rangle = 1$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ we put

$$U_\varepsilon(\ell) = \{ z \in \mathcal{D} :\ -\frac{\langle z, z \rangle}{|\langle z, \ell \rangle|^2} > \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \}.$$

In the coordinates of $\mathcal{H}_{\ell, \tilde{\ell}}$ we have

$$U_\varepsilon(\ell) \cong \{ (\mathfrak{z}, \tau) \in \mathcal{H}_{\ell, \tilde{\ell}} :\ \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z}, \tau) > 1/\varepsilon \}.$$

The stabilizer $\mathrm{U}(V)_\ell$ of $\ell$ acts on this subset. Let $\Gamma_\ell = \Gamma \cap \mathrm{U}(V)_\ell$. If $\varepsilon$ is sufficiently small, then

$$\Gamma_\ell \backslash U_\varepsilon(\ell) \longrightarrow X_\Gamma \tag{4.1.1}$$

is an open immersion. The center of $\mathrm{U}(V)_\ell$ is given by the subgroup of translations $T_a$ for $a \in \mathbb{Q}$, where

$$T_a(\lambda) = \lambda + a\langle \lambda, \ell\rangle \sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\ell$$

for $\lambda \in V$. It is isomorphic to the additive group over $\mathbb{Q}$. The action of the translations on $\mathcal{H}_{\ell,\tilde{\ell}}$ is given by $T_a(\mathfrak{z}, \tau) = (\mathfrak{z}, \tau + a)$. The center of $\Gamma_\ell$ is of the form

$$\Gamma_{\ell,T} = \{T_a :\ a \in r\mathbb{Z}\} \tag{4.1.2}$$

for a unique $r \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, which is sometimes called the *width* of the cusp $I_\mathbb{R}$. If we put $q_r = e^{2\pi i\tau/r}$, then $(\mathfrak{z}, \tau) \mapsto (\mathfrak{z}, q_r)$ defines an isomorphism from $\Gamma_{\ell,T} \backslash U_\varepsilon(\ell)$ to

$$V_\varepsilon(\ell) = \left\{ (\mathfrak{z}, q_r) \in \mathbb{C}^{n-2} \times \mathbb{C} :\ 0 < |q_r| < \exp\left( -\tfrac{\pi}{r\sqrt{|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|}}(\langle \mathfrak{z}, \mathfrak{z}\rangle + 1/\varepsilon) \right) \right\}.$$

Hence $\Gamma_{\ell,T} \backslash U_\varepsilon(\ell)$ can be viewed as a punctured disc bundle over $\mathbb{C}^{n-2}$. Adding the origin to every disc gives the disc bundle

$$\tilde{V}_\varepsilon(\ell) = \left\{ (\mathfrak{z}, q_r) \in \mathbb{C}^{n-2} \times \mathbb{C} :\ |q_r| < \exp\left( -\tfrac{\pi}{r\sqrt{|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|}}(\langle \mathfrak{z}, \mathfrak{z}\rangle + 1/\varepsilon) \right) \right\}.$$

The action of $\Gamma_\ell$ on $V_\varepsilon(\ell)$ extends to an action on $\tilde{V}_\varepsilon(\ell)$, which leaves the boundary divisor $q_r = 0$ invariant, and which is free if $\Gamma$ is sufficiently small. We obtain an open immersion of orbifolds

$$\Gamma_\ell \backslash U_\varepsilon(\ell) \longrightarrow (\Gamma_\ell / \Gamma_{\ell,T}) \backslash \tilde{V}_\varepsilon(\ell). \tag{4.1.3}$$

It can be used to glue the right hand side to $X_\Gamma$ to obtain a partial compactification, which is smooth if $\Gamma$ is sufficiently small. For a point $(\mathfrak{z}_0, 0) \in \tilde{V}_\varepsilon(\ell)$ and $\delta > 0$, we put

$$B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0, 0) = \left\{ (\mathfrak{z}, q_r) \in \tilde{V}_\varepsilon(\ell) :\ \langle \mathfrak{z} - \mathfrak{z}_0, \mathfrak{z} - \mathfrak{z}_0\rangle < \delta,\ |q_r| < \delta \right\}. \tag{4.1.4}$$

Then the images of the $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0, 0)$ for $\delta > 0$ under the natural map to $(\Gamma_\ell / \Gamma_{\ell,T}) \backslash \tilde{V}_\varepsilon(\ell)$ define a basis of open neighborhoods of the boundary point given by $(\mathfrak{z}_0, 0)$.

We let $X_\Gamma^*$ be the compactification of $X_\Gamma$ obtained by gluing the right hand side of (4.1.3) to $X_\Gamma$ for every $\Gamma$-class of $\mathrm{Iso}(V)$. We denote by $B_I$ the boundary divisor of $X_\Gamma^*$ corresponding to $I \in \mathrm{Iso}(V)$.

The behavior of the special divisor $Z(m, \varphi)$ near the boundary can be described as follows. Let $I \in \mathrm{Iso}(V)$ and let $\ell \in I$ be a generator. Let $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2m}$ be small enough such that (4.1.1) defines an open immersion. Then Lemma 4.1.1 below implies that the pullback of $Z(m, \varphi)$ to $U_\varepsilon(\ell)$ is given by the local special divisor

$$Z_\ell(m, \varphi) = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in L' \cap \ell^\perp \\ \langle \lambda, \lambda\rangle = m}} \varphi(\lambda) \mathcal{D}(\lambda).$$

**Lemma 4.1.1.** *If $z_0$ is a generator of $z \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\lambda \in V \otimes_\mathbb{Q} \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\langle \lambda, \lambda\rangle_z \geq \frac{|\langle \lambda, \ell\rangle|^2 |\langle z_0, z_0\rangle|}{2|\langle z_0, \ell\rangle|^2}.$$

*Proof.* The right hand side is independent of the choice of the generator $z_0$. Hence we may assume $\langle z_0, \ell\rangle = 1$. Moreover, both sides of the inequality remain unchanged if we act on $\lambda$ and $z_0$ with elements of the stabilizer of $\ell$ in $\mathrm{U}(V)(\mathbb{R})$. Therefore, it suffices to consider the case $z_0 = \tau\sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\ell + \tilde{\ell}$. The remaining computation we leave to the reader. □

4.2. **Regularized integrals.** Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Let $(M, Q)$ be an even integral lattice as in Section 2. Following [Bo1], for $f \in H_{-k}(\omega_M)$ and $g \in M_k(\omega_M^\vee)$ we define a regularized Petersson pairing by

$$(f, g)^{\mathrm{reg}} = \int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}}^{\mathrm{reg}} \{f(\tau), g(\tau)\} d\mu(\tau) \tag{4.2.1}$$

$$= \lim_{T\to\infty} \int_{\mathcal{F}_T} \{f(\tau), g(\tau)\} d\mu(\tau).$$

In Section 4.3 such integrals will occur as multiplicities of the boundary components, where $g$ will be the theta function of a positive definite hermitian lattice given by a quotient of $L$.

In the special case when $k = 0$ and $g$ is constant, this integral is evaluated in [Bo1, Theorem 9.1]. Here we describe how the integral can be computed when $k > 0$. We denote the Fourier expansion of $g$ by

$$g(\tau) = \sum_{m\geq 0} b(m) q^m,$$

with coefficients $b(m) \in S_M^\vee$. We let $\vartheta = q\frac{d}{dq}$ be the Ramanujan theta operator on $q$-series. Recall that the image under $\vartheta$ of a holomorphic modular form $g$ of weight $k$ is in general not a modular form. However, the function

$$\tilde{\vartheta}(g) = \vartheta(g) - \frac{k}{12} g E_2$$

is a holomorphic modular form of weight $k+2$. Here $E_2(\tau) = 1 - 24\sum_{m\geq 1}\sigma_1(m)q^m$ denotes the non-modular Eisenstein series of weight 2 for $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. If $R_k = 2i\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau} + \frac{k}{v}$ denotes the Maass raising operator and $E_2^*(\tau) = E_2(\tau) - \frac{3}{\pi v}$ the non-holomorphic (but modular) Eisenstein series of weight 2, we also have

$$\tilde{\vartheta}(g) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} R_k(g) - \frac{k}{12} g E_2^*. \tag{4.2.2}$$

If $h(q) \in \mathbb{C}((q))$ is a (formal) Laurent series in $q$, we denote by $\mathrm{CT}[h]$ its constant term.

**Theorem 4.2.1.** *Let $f \in H_{-k}(\omega_M)$ and $g \in M_k(\omega_M^\vee)$ be as above.*

(1) *If $k > 0$, then*

$$(f, g)^{\mathrm{reg}} = \frac{4\pi}{k}\,\mathrm{CT}[\{f^+, \vartheta(g)\}] = \frac{4\pi}{k}\sum_{m>0} m\cdot\{c^+(-m), b(m)\}.$$

(2) *If $k = 0$ (so that $g$ is constant), then putting $\sigma_1(0) = -\frac{1}{24}$ we have*

$$(f, g)^{\mathrm{reg}} = \frac{\pi}{3}\,\mathrm{CT}[\{f^+, gE_2)\}] = -8\pi\sum_{m\geq 0}\sigma_1(m)\cdot\{c^+(-m), g\}.$$

*Proof.* (1) We use the identity $\bar{\partial}(E_2^* d\tau) = -\frac{3}{\pi} d\mu(\tau)$ to obtain

$$(f, g)^{\mathrm{reg}} = -\frac{\pi}{3}\int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}}^{\mathrm{reg}} \{f(\tau), \bar{\partial}(gE_2^* d\tau)\}. \tag{4.2.3}$$

In view of (4.2.2), we have

$$\bar{\partial}(gE_2^* d\tau) = -\frac{3}{k\pi}\bar{\partial}(R_k(g)d\tau).$$

Putting this into (4.2.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned}(f,g)^{\mathrm{reg}} &= \frac{1}{k}\int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}}^{\mathrm{reg}} \{f(\tau), \bar{\partial}(R_k(g)d\tau)\}\\ &= \frac{1}{k}\lim_{T\to\infty}\int_{\mathcal{F}_T} d\{f(\tau), R_k(g)d\tau\} - \frac{1}{k}\int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}} \{(\bar{\partial} f), R_k(g)d\tau\}\\ &= -\frac{1}{k}\lim_{T\to\infty}\int_0^1 \{f(u+Ti), R_k(g)(u+Ti)\}du\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{k}\int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}} \{\overline{\xi_{-k}(f)}, R_k(g)\}v^{k+2}d\mu(\tau).\end{aligned}$$

The second summand on the right hand side is a Petersson scalar product which is easily seen to vanish. The first summand is equal to

$$\frac{4\pi}{k}\,\mathrm{CT}[\{f^+, \vartheta(g)\}].$$

This concludes the proof of the $k > 0$ case.

(2) If $k = 0$, and $f \in M_0^!(\omega_L)$, the assertion follows from [Bo1, Theorem 9.2]. If $f \in H_0(\omega_L)$ it can be proved in the same way. □

4.3. **Automorphic Green functions at the boundary.** Let $I \in \mathrm{Iso}(V)$ be an isotropic $\boldsymbol{k}$-line. Then $\mathfrak{a} = I \cap L$ is a projective $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module of rank 1. The $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module

$$D = L \cap \mathfrak{a}^\perp/\mathfrak{a}$$

is positive definite of rank $n-2$. Let $\ell \in \mathfrak{a}$ be a primitive (that is, $\mathbb{Q}\ell \cap \mathfrak{a} = \mathbb{Z}\ell$) isotropic vector. We write $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_0\ell$ with a fractional ideal $\mathfrak{a}_0 \subset \boldsymbol{k}$, and we let $\tilde{\ell} \in V$ be isotropic such that $\langle \tilde{\ell}, \ell\rangle = 1$.

The lattice $D$ can be realized as a sublattice of $L$ as follows. The lattice $\mathfrak{a}^* = L'_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \cap I^\perp$ is a projective $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module of rank $n-1$. The quotient $L'_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}/\mathfrak{a}^*$ is an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module of rank 1, which is projective since it is torsion free. Hence there is a projective $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module $\mathfrak{b} \subset L'_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}$ of rank 1 such that $L'_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} = \mathfrak{a}^* \oplus \mathfrak{b}$. We have $\langle \mathfrak{a}, L'_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\rangle = \langle \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}\rangle = \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ and $\langle \mathfrak{b}, L\rangle = \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. We put

$$E = L \cap \mathfrak{a}^\perp \cap \mathfrak{b}^\perp.$$

**Lemma 4.3.1.** *With $\mathfrak{a}$ defined as above,*

1. *$L \cap \mathfrak{a}^\perp = E \oplus \mathfrak{a}$ and $D \cong E$;*
2. *if $L$ is $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-self-dual then $L = E \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{b}$;*
3. *if $L$ is $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-self-dual and $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is odd then in (ii) we may chose $\mathfrak{b}$ to be isotropic.*

*Remark* 4.3.2. Assume that $\Gamma = \mathrm{U}(L)$ is the full unitary group of $L$. Let $\mathfrak{n} = \langle L, \mathfrak{a}\rangle \subset \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and denote by $N_{\mathfrak{a}}$ the positive generator of $(\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\mathfrak{n})^{-1} \cap \mathbb{Q}$. Then the quantity $r$ in (4.1.2) is equal to $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{a}_0) \cdot N_{\mathfrak{a}}$. In particular, if $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is odd and $L$ is $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-self-dual then $r = \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{a}_0)$.

Let $f \in H_{2-n}(\omega_L)$. In analogy with [Bo1, Theorem 5.3], the harmonic Maass form $f$ induces an $S_D$-valued harmonic Maass form $f_D \in H_{2-n}(\omega_D)$. It is characterized by its values on $\nu \in D'/D$ as follows:

$$f_D(\tau)(\nu) = \sum_{\substack{\mu \in L'/L \\ \mu | L\cap \mathfrak{a}^\perp = \nu}} f(\tau)(\mu). \tag{4.3.1}$$

Here $\mu \mid L \cap \mathfrak{a}^\perp$ denotes the restriction of $\mu \in \mathrm{Hom}(L, \mathbb{Z})$ to $L \cap \mathfrak{a}^\perp$, and we consider $\nu \in D'$ as an element of $\mathrm{Hom}(L \cap \mathfrak{a}^\perp, \mathbb{Z})$ via the quotient map $L \cap \mathfrak{a}^\perp \to D$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ such that (4.1.1) is an open immersion. For a boundary point $(\mathfrak{z}_0, 0) \in \tilde{V}_\varepsilon(\ell)$ and $\delta > 0$, we consider the Green function $\Phi(z, f)$ in the open neighborhood $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0, 0)$ defined in (4.1.4). The pullback of the special divisor $Z(f)$ to $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0, 0)$ is given by the linear combination of local special divisors

$$Z_\ell(f) = \sum_{m>0} \left\{c^+(-m), Z_\ell(m)\right\}.$$

Note that $Z_\ell(m)$ is invariant under the subgroup of translations $\Gamma_{\ell,T} \subset \Gamma_\ell$. The support of $Z_\ell(m)$ on $\tilde{V}_\varepsilon(\ell)$ is the union of the sets $\{(\mathfrak{z}, q_r) : \langle \mathfrak{z} + \tilde{\ell}, \lambda\rangle = 0\}$ for $\lambda \in L' \cap \ell^\perp/\Gamma_{\ell,T}$ with $\langle \lambda, \lambda\rangle = m$.

**Theorem 4.3.3.** *Let $f \in H_{2-n}(\omega_L)$ and denote its Fourier coefficients by $c^\pm(m)$. Let $(\mathfrak{z}_0, 0) \in \tilde{V}_\varepsilon(\ell)$ be a boundary point. The set*

$$S_f = \{\lambda \in L' \cap \ell^\perp : \quad \langle \lambda, \lambda\rangle > 0,\ c^+(-\langle \lambda, \lambda\rangle, \lambda) \neq 0 \text{ and } \langle \mathfrak{z}_0 + \tilde{\ell}, \lambda\rangle = 0\}$$

*is finite. If $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small, then the function*

$$\Phi(z, f) + \frac{r\Phi^D(f_D)}{2\pi \,\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{a}_0)} \log|q_r| + c^+(0, 0) \log|\log|q_r|| + 2 \sum_{\lambda \in S_f} c^+(-\langle \lambda, \lambda\rangle, \lambda) \log|\langle \mathfrak{z} + \tilde{\ell}, \lambda\rangle|$$

*has a continuation to a continuous function on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0, 0)$. It is smooth on the complement of the boundary divisor $q_r = 0$, and its images under the differentials $\partial$, $\bar\partial$, $\partial\bar\partial$ have log-log growth along the divisor $q_r = 0$ in the sense of* [BBK, Definition 1.2]*. Here $\Phi^D(f_D) = (f_D, \Theta_D)^{\mathrm{reg}}$ is the regularized Petersson pairing of $f_D$ and the theta function $\Theta_D$ as defined in* (4.2.1).

We postpone the proof of the theorem to Section 4.4.

*Remark* 4.3.4. Let $c_D^\pm(m) \in S_D$ be the coefficients of $f_D$, and write $\Theta_D(\tau) = \sum_{m\geq 0} R_D(m) q^m$, where the representation numbers $R_D(m) \in S_D^\vee$ are given by

$$R_D(m)(\varphi) = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in D' \\ Q(\lambda) = m}} \varphi(\lambda)$$

for $\varphi \in S_D$. If $n > 2$, then according to Theorem 4.2.1 we have

$$\Phi^D(f_D) = \frac{4\pi}{n-2} \mathrm{CT}[\{f_D^+, \vartheta(\Theta_D)\}] = \frac{4\pi}{n-2} \sum_{m>0} m \cdot \{c_D^+(-m), R_D(m)\}.$$

If $n = 2$, then $D$ is trivial, and we have

$$\Phi^D(f_D) = \frac{\pi}{3} \mathrm{CT}[f_D^+ \cdot E_2] = -8\pi \sum_{m\geq 0} c_D^+(-m)\sigma_1(m).$$

We now associate a boundary divisor to the harmonic Maass form $f \in H_{2-n}(\omega_L)$. We define the multiplicity of the boundary divisor $B_I$ with respect to $f$ by

$$\mathrm{mult}_{B_I}(f) = \frac{r\Phi^D(f_D)}{4\pi\,\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{a}_0)}. \tag{4.3.2}$$

If the principal part of $f$ has rational coefficients, then according to Remark 4.3.4, this multiplicity is rational. In the special case that $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is odd, $L$ is $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-self-dual, and $\Gamma = \mathrm{U}(L)$, we have in view of Remark 4.3.2 that

$$\mathrm{mult}_{B_I}(f) = \frac{1}{4\pi}\Phi^D(f_D). \tag{4.3.3}$$

We define the boundary divisor associated with $f$ by

$$B(f) = \sum_{I\in\mathrm{Iso}(V)/\Gamma} \mathrm{mult}_{B_I}(f)\cdot B_I. \tag{4.3.4}$$

Theorem 4.3.3 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.3.5.** *The function $\Phi(z,f)$ is a logarithmic Green function on $X_\Gamma^*$ for the divisor $Z(f)+B(f)$ with possible additional log-log growth along the boundary divisors $B_I$.*

## 4.4. **The Fourier-Jacobi expansion.**

Here we compute the Fourier-Jacobi expansion of the automorphic Green function $\Phi(z,f)$ using [Hof], [Bo1] and [Br1], and we provide the proofs of Theorem 4.3.3 and Proposition 3.3.4.

The natural embedding of $\mathcal{D}$ into the Grassmannian of negative definite 2-dimensional oriented real subspaces of $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ is compatible with the actions of the unitary group $\mathrm{U}(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$ and the orthogonal group $\mathrm{O}(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}})$. We may calculate the theta lift of $f\in H_{2-n}(\omega_L)$ to $X_\Gamma$ by lifting to the orthogonal group $\mathrm{O}(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}})$ and then pulling back to the unitary group.

We continue to use the setup of Section 4.3. In addition we introduce the following notation. We fix $\ell'\in L'$ such that $\langle \ell',\ell\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}=1$. We denote by $N$ the positive integer which generates the ideal $\langle L,\ell\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}\subset\mathbb{Z}$. We write $\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}}$ for the orthogonal complement of $\ell$ with respect to the bilinear form $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$, and put $K=(L\cap\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}})/\mathbb{Z}\ell$. Then $K$ is an even lattice over $\mathbb{Z}$ of signature $(2n-3,1)$.

*Remark* 4.4.1. If $\mathfrak{b}\subset L'_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}$ with $\langle\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}\rangle=\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ as in Section 4.3, we may choose $\ell'\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathfrak{b}$ and $\tilde{\ell}\in\boldsymbol{k}\ell'\oplus\boldsymbol{k}\ell$. When $L=L'_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}$ and $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is odd, then according to Lemma 4.3.1 we may choose $\mathfrak{b}$ such that it is isotropic. Then we can we can take $\tilde{\ell}\in\boldsymbol{k}\ell'$.

For $x\in V_{\mathbb{R}}$ we put $x^2=\langle x,x\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $|x|=\sqrt{|x^2|}$. Let $(\mathfrak{z},\tau)\in\mathcal{H}_{\ell,\tilde{\ell}}$ and let $z$ be the corresponding point in $\mathcal{D}$. We have

$$\ell_z^2=-\frac{2}{\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z},\tau)},$$

where the quantity $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z},\tau)=-\langle(\mathfrak{z},\tau),(\mathfrak{z},\tau)\rangle$ is positive. We also view $z$ as a two-dimensional (oriented) real subspace of $V_{\mathbb{R}}$. The vector $\ell_z$ spans a one-dimensional real subspace of $z$, whose orthogonal complement in $z$ with respect to $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$ we denote by $w$, so that $z=w\oplus\mathbb{R}\ell_z$. The real line $w$ is generated by the vector $w_0(z)=-i(\mathfrak{z},\tau)=-i(\mathfrak{z}+\tau\sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\ell+\tilde{\ell})$, which we use to define an orientation on $w$. Hence we obtain a map

$$\mathcal{D}\longrightarrow\mathrm{Gr}^+(K) \tag{4.4.1}$$

to the Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}^+(K)$ of oriented negative lines in $K\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{R}$. If $\lambda\in K\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{R}$, we have $\langle -i(\mathfrak{z},\tau),\lambda\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} = 2\,\mathrm{Im}\langle(\mathfrak{z},\tau),\lambda\rangle$. The orthogonal projection of $\lambda$ to $w$ is given by

$$\frac{|\lambda_w|}{|\ell_z|} = |\,\mathrm{Im}\langle(\mathfrak{z},\tau),\lambda\rangle|.$$

We also define the vector

$$\mu = -\ell' + \frac{\ell_z}{2\ell_z^2} + \frac{\ell_{z^\perp}}{2\ell_{z^\perp}^2}.$$

in $L\cap\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}}$. It is easily checked that

$$\langle\mu,\lambda\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathrm{Re}\langle(\mathfrak{z},\tau),\lambda\rangle.$$

For $w\in\mathrm{Gr}^+(K)$ and $\lambda\in K\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{R}$, we write $\langle w,\lambda\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}>0$ if $\langle w_0,\lambda\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}>0$ for a vector $w_0\in w$ defining the orientation.

Let $f\in H_{2-n}(\omega_L)$. Similarly as in (4.3.1), according to [Bo1, Theorem 5.3], the harmonic Maass form $f$ induces an $S_K$-valued harmonic Maass form $f_K\in H_{2-n}(\omega_K)$. It is characterized by its values on $\nu\in K'/K$ as follows:

$$f_K(\tau)(\nu) = \sum_{\substack{\mu\in L'/L\\ \mu|L\cap\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}}=\nu}} f(\tau)(\mu). \tag{4.4.2}$$

Here $\mu\mid L\cap\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}}$ denotes the restriction of $\mu\in\mathrm{Hom}(L,\mathbb{Z})$ to $L\cap\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}}$, and we consider $\nu\in K'$ as an element of $\mathrm{Hom}(L\cap\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}},\mathbb{Z})$ via the quotient map $L\cap\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}}\to K$.

Finally, following [Br1, (3.25)], we define a special function for $A,B\in\mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathcal{V}_n(A,B) = \int_0^\infty \Gamma(n-1,A^2y)e^{-B^2y-1/y}y^{-3/2}\,dy.$$

According to [Br1, p. 74] we have

$$\mathcal{V}_n(A,B) = 2(n-2)!\sum_{r=0}^{n-2}\frac{A^{2r}}{r!}(A^2+B^2)^{1/4-r/2}K_{r-1/2}(2\sqrt{A^2+B^2}).$$

The following result is now an immediate consequence of [Br1, Theorem 3.9].

**Theorem 4.4.2.** *Let $f\in H_{2-n}(\omega_L)$ and denote its Fourier coefficients by $c^\pm(m)\in S_L$. Let $z\in\mathcal{D}\smallsetminus Z(f)$ with $|\ell_z^2|<\frac{1}{2m_0}$, where $m_0=\max\{m\in\mathbb{Q}:\ c^+(-m)\neq 0\}$. Then the Green function $\Phi(z,f)$ is equal to*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}|\ell_z|}\Phi^K(w,f_K) + C_f + c^+(0,0)\log|\ell_z^2| \\
&-2\sum_{\lambda\in K'\smallsetminus\{0\}}\ \sum_{\substack{\nu\in L'/L\\ \nu|L\cap\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}}=\lambda}} c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\nu)\log\big(1-e\big(\langle\nu,\ell'\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}+\langle\lambda,\mu\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}+i|\lambda_w|/|\ell_z|\big)\big) \\
&+\frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}\sum_{\substack{\lambda\in K'\\ \langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle>0}}\ \sum_{\substack{\nu\in L'/L\\ \nu|L\cap\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}}=\lambda}} c^-(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\nu)\sum_{j\geq 1}\frac{1}{j}e\big(j\langle\nu,\ell'\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}+j\langle\lambda,\mu\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}\big)\mathcal{V}_n\left(\frac{\pi j|\lambda|}{|\ell_z|},\frac{\pi j|\lambda_w|}{|\ell_z|}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

*where*

$$C_f = -c^+(0,0)\left(\log(2\pi)+\Gamma'(1)\right) - 2\sum_{\substack{a\in\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}\\ a\neq 0}} c^+(0,a\ell/N)\log|1-e(a/N)|.$$

*Here* $\Phi^K(w, f_K)$ *denotes the function on* $\mathrm{Gr}^+(K)$ *given by the regularized theta lift of* $f_K$ *for the orthogonal group of* $K$ *as in* [Br1, Chapter 3.1]*. We view it as a function on* $\mathcal{D}$ *via the map* (4.4.1)*. Finally,* $\log(z)$ *stands for the principle branch of the complex logarithm.* □

*Remark* 4.4.3. If $f \in M^!_{2-n}(\omega_L)$ is weakly holomorphic, then according to [Hof, Theorem 4.2.1] there exists a meromorphic modular form $\Psi(z, f)$ of weight $c^+(0,0)/2$ for the group $\Gamma$ (with a multiplier system of finite order) such that $-2\log\|\Psi(z,f)\|^2 = \Phi(z,f)$ and $\mathrm{div}(\Psi(z,f)) = \frac{1}{2}Z(f)$. Here $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the suitably normalized Petersson metric. The above Fourier expansion of $\Phi(z,f)$ leads to the Borcherds product expansion

$$\Psi(z,f) = e\big(\langle(\mathfrak{z},\tau),\varrho_W\rangle\big) \prod_{\substack{\lambda\in K'\\ \langle W,\lambda\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}>0}} \prod_{\substack{\nu\in L'/L\\ \nu|L\cap\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}}=\lambda}} \big(1 - e(\langle\nu,\ell'\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} + \langle(\mathfrak{z},\tau),\lambda\rangle)\big)^{c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\nu)},$$

which converges for $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z},\tau) > 4m_0$. Here $W \subset \mathrm{Gr}^+(K)$ denotes a Weyl chamber corresponding to $f$ (that is, a connected component of the complement of the singular locus of $\Phi^K(w,f)$), and $\varrho_W \subset K\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{Q}$ denotes the corresponding Weyl vector. Moreover $\langle W,\lambda\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} > 0$ means that $\langle w,\lambda\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} > 0$ for $w\in W$, see [Hof, Section 4.1.2].

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 4.3.3. We begin with two technical lemmas. The first one gives an estimate for the majorant of the lattice $K$. For $0 < C < 1$ we define

$$\mathcal{S}_C = \{(\mathfrak{z},\tau)\in\mathcal{H}_{\ell,\tilde{\ell}} : \quad C\cdot 2\sqrt{|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|}\,\mathrm{Im}(\tau) > \langle\mathfrak{z},\mathfrak{z}\rangle\}.$$

For $\lambda\in K\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{R}$ and $(\mathfrak{z},\tau)\in\mathcal{H}_{\ell,\tilde{\ell}}$ we define

$$h((\mathfrak{z},\tau),\lambda) = \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z},\tau)\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle + 2(\mathrm{Im}\langle(\mathfrak{z},\tau),\lambda\rangle)^2.$$

**Lemma 4.4.4.** *Let* $0 < C < 1$*. There exists an* $\varepsilon > 0$ *such that for any* $(\mathfrak{z},\tau)\in\mathcal{S}_C$ *and any* $\lambda = \lambda_D - a\sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\ell - \frac{b}{\sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}}\tilde{\ell}\in K\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{R}$ *(where* $\lambda_D\in D\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{R}$ *and* $a,b\in\mathbb{R}$*), we have*

$$h((\mathfrak{z},\tau),\lambda) \ge \varepsilon\left(a^2|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}| + b^2\,\mathrm{Im}(\tau)^2 + \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z},\tau)\langle\lambda_D,\lambda_D\rangle\right).$$

*Proof.* This result can be viewed as a lower bound for the majorant $\langle\lambda_{w^\perp},\lambda_{w^\perp}\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} - \langle\lambda_w,\lambda_w\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$ associated to the negative line $w = \mathbb{R}w_0(z)\in\mathrm{Gr}^+(K)$. It directly follows from [Br1, Lemma 4.13]. Note that in the proof of this lemma, of the equalities defining $\mathcal{R}_t$ we only need that $|q(Y_D)| < By_1y_2$ with $B = \frac{t^4}{t^4+1}$ and $t > 0$. □

**Corollary 4.4.5.** *Let* $0 < C < 1$*. There exists an* $\varepsilon > 0$ *such that for any* $(\mathfrak{z},\tau)\in\mathcal{S}_C$ *and any* $\lambda = \lambda_D - a\sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\ell - \frac{b}{\sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}}\tilde{\ell}\in K\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{R}$ *(where* $\lambda_D\in D\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{R}$ *and* $a,b\in\mathbb{R}$*) with* $\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle\le 0$*, we have*

$$(\mathrm{Im}\langle(\mathfrak{z},\tau),\lambda\rangle)^2 \ge \varepsilon\left(a^2|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}| + b^2\,\mathrm{Im}(\tau)^2 + \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z},\tau)\langle\lambda_D,\lambda_D\rangle\right).$$

The following lemma is a useful variant of the corollary.

**Lemma 4.4.6.** *Let* $A\ge 0$ *and* $0\le B < 1$*. Assume that* $\mathrm{Im}(\tau) > \frac{(|\mathfrak{z}|+2A)^2}{4|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|(1-B)^2}$*. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{Im}\langle(\mathfrak{z},\tau),\lambda\rangle - A|\lambda| \ge B\left(a|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}| + b\,\mathrm{Im}(\tau)\right)$$

*for all* $\lambda = \lambda_D - a\sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\ell - \frac{b}{\sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}}\tilde{\ell}\in K\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{R}$ *with* $b\ge 0$ *and* $\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle\le 0$*.*

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Im}\langle(\mathfrak{z},\tau),\lambda\rangle &= \mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z},\lambda_D\rangle + a\sqrt{|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|} + b\,\mathrm{Im}(\tau)\\ &\ge -\frac{1}{2}|\lambda_D|\cdot|\mathfrak{z}| + a\sqrt{|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|} + b\,\mathrm{Im}(\tau).\end{aligned}$$

Since $0 \geq \langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle = \langle \lambda_D, \lambda_D \rangle - 2ab$, we also have $|\lambda|^2 \leq 4ab$ and $|\lambda_D|^2 \leq 4ab$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Im}\langle (\mathfrak{z}, \tau), \lambda \rangle - A|\lambda| &\geq a\sqrt{|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|} + b \operatorname{Im}(\tau) - \sqrt{ab} \cdot (|\mathfrak{z}| + 2A) \\ &\geq B\left(a|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}| + b \operatorname{Im}(\tau)\right) \\ &\quad + (1 - B)\left(a|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}| + b \operatorname{Im}(\tau)\right) - \sqrt{ab} \cdot (|\mathfrak{z}| + 2A).\end{aligned}$$

The quantity in the latter line can be interpreted as a binary quadratic form in $\sqrt{a}$ and $\sqrt{b}$, which is positive definite if $\operatorname{Im}(\tau) > \frac{(|\mathfrak{z}|+2A)^2}{4|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|(1-B)^2}$. This implies the assertion. $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.3.3.* It is easily seen that $S_f$ is finite. To obtain the claimed analytic properties of $\Phi(z, f)$ on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0, 0)$, we consider the different terms of the Fourier expansion given in Theorem 4.4.2.

*1.* We begin with the term

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \in K' \\ \langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle > 0}} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in L'/L \\ \nu | L \cap \ell^{\perp, \mathbb{Q}} = \lambda}} c^-(-\langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle, \nu) \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{1}{j} e\big(j\langle \nu, \ell' \rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} + j\langle \lambda, \mu \rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}\big) \mathcal{V}_n\left(\frac{\pi j |\lambda|}{|\ell_z|}, \frac{\pi j |\lambda_w|}{|\ell_z|}\right).$$

According to [Br1, equality (3.26)], the function $\mathcal{V}_n(A, B)$ is bounded by a constant multiple of $e^{-\sqrt{A^2+B^2}}$. Moreover, for $\lambda \in K'$ with $\langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle > 0$ we have

$$2\frac{\lambda^2}{|\ell_z^2|} + 2\frac{|\lambda_w^2|}{|\ell_z^2|} > \frac{\lambda^2}{|\ell_z^2|} + 2\frac{|\lambda_w^2|}{|\ell_z^2|} = h((\mathfrak{z}, \tau), \lambda).$$

If we write $\lambda = \lambda_D - a\sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\ell - \frac{b}{\sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}}\tilde{\ell}$ (where $\lambda_D \in D \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$), then in view of Lemma 4.4.4 there exists an $\varepsilon' > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{V}_n\left(\frac{\pi j |\lambda|}{|\ell_z|}, \frac{\pi j |\lambda_w|}{|\ell_z|}\right) \ll \exp\left(-\varepsilon' j \sqrt{a^2|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}| + b^2 \operatorname{Im}(\tau)^2 + \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z}, \tau)\langle \lambda_D, \lambda_D \rangle}\right).$$

Since the coefficients $c^-(m, \mu)$ have only polynomial growth as $m \to -\infty$, we find that the above sum over $\lambda \in K'$ converges uniformly on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0, 0)$ to a function which is bounded by $O(\exp(-\varepsilon''\sqrt{-\log|q_r|}))$ as $q_r \to 0$ for some $\varepsilon'' > 0$. Hence this sum converges to a continuous function on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0, 0)$ which vanishes along the divisor $q_r = 0$. Analogous estimates hold for all iterated partial derivatives with respect to $(\mathfrak{z}, \tau)$. Using the fact that $d\tau = \frac{r}{2\pi i} \frac{dq_r}{q_r}$, we obtain that the differentials $\partial$, $\bar{\partial}$, $\partial\bar{\partial}$ of this function have log-log growth along $q_r = 0$.

*2.* For the term $c^+(0, 0) \log |\ell_z^2|$, we notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\log |\ell_z^2| &= -\log(\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z}, \tau)/2) \\ &= -\log\left(\sqrt{|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|} \operatorname{Im}(\tau) - \langle \mathfrak{z}, \mathfrak{z} \rangle/2\right) \\ &= -\log\left(-\log|q_r|\right) - \log\left(\frac{r\sqrt{|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|}}{2\pi} + \frac{\langle \mathfrak{z}, \mathfrak{z} \rangle}{2\log|q_r|}\right).\end{aligned}$$

The second summand on the right hand side extends to a continuous function on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0, 0)$ whose differentials have log-log growth along the boundary divisor $q_r = 0$.

*3.* Next, we consider the term

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\lambda\in K'\smallsetminus\{0\}}\ \sum_{\substack{\nu\in L'/L\\ \nu|L\cap\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}}=\lambda}} c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\nu)\log\big(1-e\big(\langle\nu,\ell'\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}+\langle\lambda,\mu\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}+i|\lambda_w|/|\ell_z|\big)\big)\\ &=\sum_{\lambda\in K'\smallsetminus\{0\}}\ \sum_{\substack{\nu\in L'/L\\ \nu|L\cap\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}}=\lambda}} c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\nu)\log\big(1-e\big(\langle\nu,\ell'\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}+\mathrm{Re}\langle(\mathfrak{z},\tau),\lambda\rangle+i|\,\mathrm{Im}\langle(\mathfrak{z},\tau),\lambda\rangle|\big)\big)\,.\end{aligned}$$

There exists a constant $C>0$ such that $c^+(m,\nu)=O(e^{C\sqrt{m}})$ for $m\to\infty$. Hence it follows from Corollary 4.4.5 and Lemma 4.4.6, that the sum over $\lambda\in K'$ with $\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle<0$ converges uniformly on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0,0)$ to a function which is bounded by $O(\exp(-\varepsilon''\sqrt{-\log|q_r|}))$ as $q_r\to 0$ for some $\varepsilon''>0$. Observe that $\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle<0$ implies that $\langle\lambda,\ell\rangle\neq 0$.

Moreover, Lemma 4.4.4 implies that, if $\delta$ is sufficiently small, the sum over $\lambda\in K'$ with $\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle\geq 0$ and $\langle\lambda,\ell\rangle\neq 0$ converges uniformly on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0,0)$ to a function which is bounded by $O(\exp(-\varepsilon''\sqrt{-\log|q_r|}))$ as $q_r\to 0$ for some $\varepsilon''>0$. Analogous estimates hold for all iterated partial derivatives with respect to $(\mathfrak{z},\tau)$. Hence, up to a continuous function with log-log growth differentials, the above sum is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\substack{\lambda\in K'\smallsetminus\{0\}\\ \langle\lambda,\ell\rangle=0}}\ \sum_{\substack{\nu\in L'/L\\ \nu|L\cap\ell^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}}=\lambda}} c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\nu)\log\big(1-e\big(\langle\nu,\ell'\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}+\langle\lambda,\mu\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}+i|\lambda_w|/|\ell_z|\big)\big)\\ &\quad=\sum_{\substack{\lambda\in L'\cap\ell^\perp/\mathbb{Z}\ell\\ \lambda\neq 0}} c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\lambda)\log\Big(1-e\big(\mathrm{Re}\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle+i|\,\mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle|\big)\Big)\,.\end{aligned}\tag{4.4.3}$$

Notice that the this sum does not depend on $\tau$. We let $T_f$ be the finite set

$$T_f=\{\lambda\in L'\cap\ell^\perp/\mathbb{Z}\ell:\quad \langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle>0,\ c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\lambda)\neq 0\text{ and }\mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z}_0+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle=0\},\tag{4.4.4}$$

and we let $\tilde{T}_f$ be a fixed system of representatives for $T_f/\{\pm 1\}$. If $\delta$ is sufficiently small, then on the the right hand side of (4.4.3), the sum over those $\lambda$ which do not belong to $T_f$ defines a smooth function on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0,0)$. Hence, up to a smooth function, (4.4.3) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\lambda\in T_f} c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\lambda)\log\Big(1-e\big(\mathrm{Re}\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle+i|\,\mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle|\big)\Big)\\ &=\sum_{\lambda\in\tilde{T}_f} c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\lambda)\log\Big|1-e\big(\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle\big)\Big|^2+4\pi\sum_{\substack{\lambda\in\tilde{T}_f\\ \mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle<0}} c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\lambda)\,\mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

We find that (4.4.3) is the sum of a smooth function on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0,0)$ and

$$\sum_{\lambda\in S_f} c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\lambda)\log|\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle|+4\pi\sum_{\substack{\lambda\in\tilde{T}_f\\ \mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle<0}} c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\lambda)\,\mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle.\tag{4.4.5}$$

*4.* It remains to consider the quantity $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}|\ell_z|}\Phi^K(w,f_K)$. Let $\ell_K\in(\boldsymbol{k}\ell\cap L)/\mathbb{Z}\ell=\mathfrak{a}/\mathbb{Z}\ell$ be a primitive vector. Then $\mathfrak{a}=\mathbb{Z}\ell_K+\mathbb{Z}\ell$. If we write $\ell_K=a\ell$ with $a\in\boldsymbol{k}$, we have $\mathfrak{a}=\mathfrak{a}_0\ell$ with $\mathfrak{a}_0=\mathbb{Z}a+\mathbb{Z}\subset\boldsymbol{k}$ and

$$\frac{2\,\mathrm{Im}(a)}{\sqrt{|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|}}=\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{a}_0).\tag{4.4.6}$$

The positive definite lattice $K\cap\ell_K^{\perp,\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Z}\ell_K$ is isomorphic to the $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-lattice $D=L\cap\mathfrak{a}^\perp/\mathfrak{a}$. We use the Fourier expansion given in [Br1, Chapter 3.1] with respect to the primitive isotropic vector $\ell_K$, to describe the behavior on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0,0)$. The vector

$$w_1=-i\frac{(\mathfrak{z},\tau)}{\sqrt{2\,\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z},\tau)}}$$

is the unique positively oriented vector in the real line $w$ of length $-1$. For $\lambda\in D\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle w_1,\lambda\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}&=\frac{\sqrt{2}\,\mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z},\lambda\rangle}{\sqrt{\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z},\tau)}},\\ \langle w_1,\ell_K\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}&=\frac{\sqrt{2}\,\mathrm{Im}(a)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z},\tau)}}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\ell_K'\in K'$ such that $\langle\ell_K',\ell_K\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}=1$. According to [Br1, p. 68], we have in our present notation that

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^K(w_1,f_K)={}&\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\langle w_1,\ell_K\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}}\Phi^D(f_D)\\ &+4\sqrt{2}\pi\langle w_1,\ell_K\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}\sum_{\lambda\in D'}\sum_{\substack{\nu\in L'/L\\ \nu|L\cap\ell^\perp=\lambda}}c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\nu)\mathbb{B}_2\left(\frac{\langle w_1,\lambda\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}}{\langle w_1,\ell_K\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}}+\langle\nu,\ell_K'\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}\right)\\ &+4\sqrt{2}\left(\frac{\pi}{\langle w_1,\ell_K\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}}\right)^{n-2}\sum_{\lambda\in D'\setminus\{0\}}\sum_{\substack{\nu\in L'/L\\ \nu|L\cap\ell^\perp=\lambda}}c^-(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\nu)|\lambda|^{n-1}\\ &\times\sum_{j\geq1}j^{n-3}e\left(j\frac{\langle w_1,\lambda\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}}{\langle w_1,\ell_K\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}}+j\langle\nu,\ell_K'\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}\right)K_{n-1}\left(\frac{2\pi j|\lambda|}{\langle w_1,\ell_K\rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{4.4.7}$$

Here $\mathbb{B}_2(x)$ denotes the 1-periodic function on $\mathbb{R}$ which agrees on $0\leq x<1$ with the second Bernoulli polynomial $B_2(x)=x^2-x+1/6$, and $K_\nu(x)$ denotes the $K$-Bessel function. Because of the exponential decay of the $K$-Bessel function, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}|\ell_z|}\Phi^K(w,f_K)=\frac{\sqrt{\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z},\tau)}}{2}\Phi^K(w,f_K)\\ &=\frac{\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z},\tau)}{4\,\mathrm{Im}(a)}\Phi^D(f_D)+4\pi\,\mathrm{Im}(a)\sum_{\lambda\in L'\cap\mathfrak{a}^\perp/\mathfrak{a}}c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\lambda)\mathbb{B}_2\left(\frac{\mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle}{\mathrm{Im}(a)}\right)+s(\mathfrak{z},\tau),\end{aligned}$$

where $s(\mathfrak{z},\tau)$ is a continuous function on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0,0)$ with log-log growth differentials. If $\delta$ is sufficiently small, then the second summand on the right hand side is the sum of a smooth function on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0,0)$ and

$$8\pi\sum_{\substack{\lambda\in\tilde{T}_f\\ \mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle<0}}c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\lambda)\,\mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle.$$

Note that this term is the negative of the contribution coming from the second quantity in (4.4.5). We obtain that up to a continuous function on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0,0)$ with log-log growth differentials, the term $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}|\ell_z|}\Phi^K(w,f_K)$ is equal to

$$-\frac{r\Phi^D(f_D)}{2\pi\,\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{a}_0)}\log|q_r| + 8\pi \sum_{\substack{\lambda\in\tilde{T}_f\\ \mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle<0}} c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\lambda)\,\mathrm{Im}\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle. \tag{4.4.8}$$

Here we have also used (4.4.6).

*5.* Adding together all the contributions, we find that if $\delta$ is sufficiently small, then

$$\Phi(z,f)+\frac{r\Phi^D(f_D)}{2\pi\,\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{a}_0)}\log|q_r| + c^+(0,0)\log|\log|q_r|| + 2\sum_{\lambda\in S_f} c^+(-\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle,\lambda)\log|\langle\mathfrak{z}+\tilde{\ell},\lambda\rangle|$$

has a continuation to a continuous function on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0,0)$. It is smooth on the complement of the boundary divisor $q_r=0$, and its images under the differentials $\partial$, $\bar\partial$, $\partial\bar\partial$ have log-log growth along the divisor $q_r=0$. ☐

*Proof of Proposition 3.3.4.* We only prove that for $n>3$ the Green function $\Phi(z,f)$ belongs to $L^2(X_\Gamma^*,\Omega^{n-1})=L^2(X_\Gamma,\Omega^{n-1})$. The other assertion can be proved analogously. Since $X_\Gamma^*$ is compact, it suffices to show this locally for a small neighborhood of any point of $X_\Gamma^*$. Since $\Phi(z,f)$ has only logarithmic singularities outside the boundary, and since $\Omega^{n-1}$ is smooth outside the boundary, this is clear outside the boundary points.

Therefore it suffices to show that for any primitive isotropic vector $\ell\in L$ and any boundary point $(\mathfrak{z}_0,0)\in\tilde{V}_\varepsilon(\ell)$ the function $\Phi(z,f)$ is square integrable with respect to the measure $\Omega^{n-1}$ in a small neighborhood $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0,0)$.

It is easily seen that there exists a non-zero constant $c$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega^{n-1} &= c\cdot\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{z},\tau)^{-n}d\mathfrak{z}\,d\bar{\mathfrak{z}}\,d\tau\,d\bar\tau\\ &= -\frac{r^2c}{4\pi^2}\cdot\left(\frac{\sqrt{|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|}r}{\pi}\log|q_r|-\langle\mathfrak{z},\mathfrak{z}\rangle\right)^{-n}d\mathfrak{z}\,d\bar{\mathfrak{z}}\,\frac{dq_r\,d\bar q_r}{|q_r|^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Here we have put $d\mathfrak{z}=d\mathfrak{z}_1\cdots d\mathfrak{z}_{n-2}$. Hence, according to Theorem 4.3.3, it suffices to show that $\log|q_r|$ is square integrable on $B_\delta(\mathfrak{z}_0,0)$ with respect to the measure $\Omega^{n-1}$. Since $n>3$, this is now easily seen. ☐

## 5. INTEGRAL MODELS OF SHIMURA VARIETIES

In this section we introduce the arithmetic Shimura variety `M` on which we will be doing intersection theory, and introduce certain cycles on `M` in dimension one and codimension one.

For the remainder of the article we assume that $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is odd. This hypothesis will be used in several places, but the primary reason for this assumption is that when $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is even, Theorem 5.1.4 below is not known (or necessarily expected) to be true. It is Theorem 5.1.4 that tells us that the Shimura variety `M` is regular, and regularity is a prerequisite for a having a good intersection theory.

### 5.1. The stack `M` and the Kudla-Rapoport divisors.

Let $\mathtt{M}_{(m,0)}$ be the algebraic stack over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ whose functor of points assigns to an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-scheme $S$ the groupoid[2] of triples $(A,\psi,i)$, in which

- $A$ is an abelian scheme over $S$ of relative dimension $m$,
- $\psi : A\to A^\vee$ is a principal polarization,

---

[2] Recall that a *groupoid* is a category in which all morphisms are invertible.

- $i : \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \to \mathrm{End}(A)$ is an action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ on $A$.

We insist that the polarization $\psi$ be $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-linear, in the sense that $\psi \circ i(\overline{x}) = i(x)^\vee \circ \psi$ for every $x \in \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. We further insist that the action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ satisfy the *signature* $(m, 0)$ *condition*: the induced action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ on the $\mathcal{O}_S$-module $\mathrm{Lie}(A)$ is through the structure morphism $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \to \mathcal{O}_S$. We usually just write $A \in \mathtt{M}_{(m,0)}(S)$ for an $S$-valued point, and suppress $\psi$ and $i$ from the notation.

*Remark* 5.1.1. The stack $\mathtt{M}_{(1,0)}$ is simply the moduli space of elliptic curves with complex multiplication by $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, with the action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ on Lie algebras normalized in a prescribed way.

*Remark* 5.1.2. The stack $\mathtt{M}_{(0,m)}$ is defined in exactly the same way as $\mathtt{M}_{(m,0)}$, except that the signature condition is replaced by the *signature* $(0, m)$ *condition*: the induced action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ on $\mathrm{Lie}(A)$ is through the complex conjugate of the structure morphism $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \to \mathcal{O}_S$. The stack $\mathtt{M}_{(0,m)}$ is obtained from $\mathtt{M}_{(m,0)}$ by pullback through complex conjugation $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}) \to \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$ on the base.

The following result is a restatement of [Ho3, Proposition 2.1.2].

**Proposition 5.1.3.** *The stack* $\mathtt{M}_{(m,0)}$ *is smooth and proper of relative dimension* $0$ *over* $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$*. In particular, it is regular and flat over* $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$*. The same results hold for* $\mathtt{M}_{(0,m)}$*.*

Let $\mathtt{M}_{(m,1)}$ be the algebraic stack over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ whose functor of points assigns to an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-scheme $S$ the groupoid of quadruples $(A, \psi, i, \mathcal{F})$ in which

- $A$ is an abelian scheme over $S$ of relative dimension $m + 1$,
- $\psi : A \to A^\vee$ is a principal polarization of $A$,
- $i : \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \to \mathrm{End}(A)$ is an action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ on $A$,
- $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathrm{Lie}(A)$ is an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-stable $\mathcal{O}_S$-submodule, which is locally an $\mathcal{O}_S$-module direct summand of rank $m$.

We again insist that $\psi$ be $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-linear, and that the subsheaf $\mathcal{F}$ satisfy *Krämer's signature* $(m, 1)$ *condition*: the action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ on $\mathcal{F}$ is through the structure morphism $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \to \mathcal{O}_S$, while the action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ on the line bundle $\mathrm{Lie}(A)/\mathcal{F}$ is through the complex conjugate of the structure morphism. When no confusion will arise, we suppress $\psi$, $i$, and $\mathcal{F}$ from the notation, and write $S$-valued points as $A \in \mathtt{M}_{(m,1)}(S)$.

The following theorem follows from results of Krämer [Kr] and Pappas [Pa].

**Theorem 5.1.4** (Krämer, Pappas)**.** *The stack* $\mathtt{M}_{(m,1)}$ *is regular, flat over* $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ *of relative dimension* $m$*, and smooth over* $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}[1/d_{\boldsymbol{k}}]$*.*

For a fixed $n \geq 2$, we next define divisors on the $n$-dimensional regular algebraic stack

$$\mathtt{M} = \mathtt{M}_{(1,0)} \times_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \mathtt{M}_{(n-1,1)},$$

following Kudla-Rapoport [KR2, Section 2]. Let $S$ be a connected $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-scheme. For any pair $(A_0, A) \in \mathtt{M}(S)$ we may form the $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module

$$L(A_0, A) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(A_0, A). \tag{5.1.1}$$

This module is equipped with the positive definite hermitian form

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \psi_0^{-1} \circ y^\vee \circ \psi \circ x,$$

where the composition on the right is viewed as an element of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(A_0)$.

**Definition 5.1.5.** For each positive $m \in \mathbb{Q}$ and each $\mathfrak{r} \mid \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, define the *Kudla-Rapoport divisor* $\mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r})$ to be the algebraic stack over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ whose functor of points assigns to every connected $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-scheme $S$ the groupoid of all triples $(A_0, A, \lambda)$ in which

- $(A_0, A) \in \mathtt{M}(S)$,
- $\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0, A)$ satisfies $\langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle = m$,

and the morphism $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda : A_0 \to A$ induces the trivial map

$$\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda : \mathrm{Lie}(A_0) \to \mathrm{Lie}(A)/\mathcal{F}, \tag{5.1.2}$$

where $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is any $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module generator of $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$.

*Remark* 5.1.6. Of course (2.1.1) implies that $\mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r}) = \emptyset$ unless $m \in \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r})^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$.

*Remark* 5.1.7. The vanishing of (5.1.2) is automatic if $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r}) \in \mathcal{O}_S^\times$. In general, if $N$ is any $\mathcal{O}_S$-module with a commuting action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and if $\alpha n = \overline{\alpha} n$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ and $n \in N$, then $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}} N = 0$. If $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r}) \in \mathcal{O}_S^\times$ then any $\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0, A)$ induces an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-linear map

$$\lambda : \mathrm{Lie}(A_0) \to \mathrm{Lie}(A)/\mathcal{F}.$$

Recalling that $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ acts on the $\mathrm{Lie}(A_0)$ through the structure morphism $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \to \mathcal{O}_S$, and acts on the quotient $\mathrm{Lie}(A)/\mathcal{F}$ through the complex conjugate, we may take $N$ to be the image of this map to see that (5.1.2) is trivial.

*Remark* 5.1.8. When $\mathfrak{r} = \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, our Kudla-Rapoport divisors are related to the $\mathcal{Z}(m)$ of [KR2] as follows. In [*loc. cit.*] there is a stack $\mathcal{M}(n-1, 1)$ similar to our $\mathtt{M}_{(n-1,1)}$, but defined by imposing *Pappas's wedge conditions* on $\mathrm{Lie}(A)$, instead of imposing the subsheaf $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathrm{Lie}(A)$. Forgetting the subsheaf $\mathcal{F}$ defines a morphism $\mathtt{M}_{(n-1,1)} \to \mathcal{M}(n-1, 1)$, which induces a morphism from $\mathtt{M}$ to the stack $\mathcal{M}$ of [*loc. cit.*]. Our $\mathtt{Z}(m, \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$ is the pullback of $\mathcal{Z}(m)$ to $\mathtt{M}$.

When $\mathfrak{r} \neq \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, our $\mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r})$ is not the pullback of any divisor on $\mathcal{M}$, because one needs the subsheaf $\mathcal{F}$ in order to formulate the vanishing condition (5.1.2).

The forgetful map $\mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r}) \to \mathtt{M}$ is finite, unramified, and representable, as in [KR2, Proposition 2.10]. Using the following proposition, we may view $\mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r})$ as a divisor on $\mathtt{M}$ in the usual way (the meaning of this is explained in detail in Section 7.1).

**Proposition 5.1.9.** *The stack* $\mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r})$ *is a local complete intersection of dimension* $n-1$.

*Proof.* When $\mathfrak{r} = \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ this is [Ho3, Proposition 3.2.3]. The methods will be used again in Section 7.4, and so we give the argument in the general case. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be an algebraically closed field, let

$$z = (A_0, A, \lambda) \in \mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r})(\mathbb{F})$$

be a geometric point, and let

$$y = (A_0, A) \in \mathtt{M}(\mathbb{F})$$

be the point below $z$. Denote by $R_z$ the completed étale local ring of $\mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r})$ at $z$, and by $R_y$ the completed étale local ring of $\mathtt{M}$ at $y$. By the regularity of $\mathtt{M}$, it suffices to show that the kernel $I$ of the natural surjection $R_y \to R_z$ is generated by a single nonzero element. Set $\tilde{R}_z = R_y/I\mathfrak{m}_y$, where $\mathfrak{m}_y \subset R_y$ is the maximal ideal, so that $\mathcal{I} = \ker(\tilde{R}_z \to R_z)$ satisfies $\mathcal{I}^2 = 0$. By Nakayama's lemma, to show that $I$ is principal it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{I} = I/\mathfrak{m}_y I$ is principal.

If we let $W$ denote the completed étale local ring of $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$ at the point below $z$, then $R_y$ and $R_z$ pro-represent the deformation functors of $(A_0, A)$ and $(A_0, A, \lambda)$ to Artinian local $W$-algebras with residue field $\mathbb{F}$. Let $(\boldsymbol{A}_0, \boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ be the universal deformation of $(A_0, A, \lambda)$ to $R_z$, and let $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0, \tilde{\boldsymbol{A}})$ be the reduction to $\tilde{R}_z$ of the universal object over $R_y$. Fix a $\Pi \in \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ satisfying $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} = \mathbb{Z}[\Pi]$, and set

$$J = \Pi \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \Pi \in \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \tilde{R}_z.$$

Note that $J$ generates the kernel of the natural map $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \tilde{R}_z \to \tilde{R}_z$. The algebraic de Rham homology (see Section 7.2) of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ sits in a short exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathrm{Fil}^1(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}) \to H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}) \to 0,$$

of free $\tilde{R}_z$-modules, and similarly with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ replaced by $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0$. Moreover, $H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0)$ is free of rank one over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \tilde{R}_z$, and

$$\mathrm{Fil}^1(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0) = J H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0).$$

For the proof of this last equality, note that $J\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0) = 0$, which proves one inclusion; equality then follows as both sides are rank one $\tilde{R}_z$-module direct summands of $H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0)$.

As the subsheaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subset \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}})$ is annihilated by $J$, the Lie algebra $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}})$ admits an $\tilde{R}_z$-module basis $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is generated by $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_{n-1}$, and $J$ acts on $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}})$ as

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & j_1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & j_n \end{bmatrix}$$

for some $j_1, \ldots, j_n \in \tilde{R}_z$. The essential fact, proved in the course of proving [Ho3, Proposition 3.2.3], is that for any such basis the ideal $(j_1, \ldots, j_n) \subset \tilde{R}_z$ is principal.

First suppose that $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r}) \in \mathbb{F}^\times$, so that $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1} L(\boldsymbol{A}_0, \boldsymbol{A})$ induces a map

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} : H_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A}).$$

As the kernel of $\tilde{R}_z \to R_z$ has square zero, the deformation theory of [Lan, Chapter 2] tells us that this map has a canonical lift to a map

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} : H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}),$$

and the maximal quotient of $\tilde{R}_z$ over which $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ deforms is defined by the vanishing of the composition

$$\mathrm{Fil}^1(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}) \to H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}} H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}).$$

Note that the deformation of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ to this maximal quotient automatically satisfies the extra vanishing condition of (5.1.2), by Remark 5.1.7. On the other hand, we know by the universality of $(\boldsymbol{A}_0, \boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ that this maximal quotient is $\tilde{R}_z/\mathcal{I} = R_z$. Thus $R_z$ is the maximal quotient of $\tilde{R}_z$ in which

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(J H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0)) \in \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}})$$

vanishes. If we fix an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} S$-module generator $\sigma \in H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0)$ and write $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\sigma) = \sum a_i \epsilon_i$ in $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}})$ in terms of our basis $\{\epsilon_i\}$, then

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(J\sigma) = J\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\sigma) = a_n \sum j_i \epsilon_i$$

vanishes if and only if $a_n j_i = 0$ for every $i$. Using the principality of the ideal $(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$, this vanishing locus is defined by a single equation, and so the kernel of $\tilde{R}_z \to R_z$ is principal.

Now suppose $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r}) = 0$ in $\mathbb{F}$, so that $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}} \tilde{R}_z = \mathfrak{r}\tilde{R}_z$. In this case $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ determines a map

$$\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\boldsymbol{\lambda} : H_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A})$$

which admits a canonical deformation to

$$\widetilde{\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\boldsymbol{\lambda}} : H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}).$$

The maximal quotient of $\tilde{R}_z$ to which $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ deforms is defined by the relations

(1) $\widetilde{\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(J H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0)) = 0$ in $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}})$,

(2) $\widetilde{\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(H_1^{dR}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0)) = 0$ in $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}})/\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$.

It is the second relation that guarantees that the deformation of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ satisfies the vanishing condition of (5.1.2). But $J\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = 0$, and so the second relation implies the first. Keeping $\sigma$ as above, we have now shown that $R_z$ is the maximal quotient of $\tilde{R}_z$ in which $\widetilde{\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\sigma) = 0$ in $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}})/\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. As $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}})/\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is free of rank one over $\tilde{R}_z$, the kernel of $\tilde{R}_z \to R_z$ is principal.

It only remains to show that $I \neq 0$. If $I = 0$ then, as $\mathtt{M}$ is $n$ dimensional and flat over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, the same would be true of the local ring $R_z$. This would imply that $\mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r})(\mathbb{C})$ contains an irreducible component of dimension $n-1$. But the complex uniformization of $\mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r})$ described in Section 6.1 shows that $\mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r})(\mathbb{C})$ has dimension $n-2$. □

If $S = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F})$ for an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{F}$, and $\ell \neq \mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F})$ is a prime, then

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\ell}}(T_\ell(A_0), T_\ell(A)) \tag{5.1.3}$$

carries a hermitian form defined in the same way as the form on (5.1.1). Here $T_\ell$ denotes $\ell$-adic Tate module. Although $L(A_0, A)$ need not be self-dual, an easy linear algebra exercise shows that (5.1.3) always is; this is a consequence of the hypothesis that the polarizations $\psi_0$ and $\psi$ are principal.

If $S = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{C})$ then we may form the Betti homology groups

$$\mathfrak{A}_0 = H_1(A_0(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z}), \qquad \mathfrak{A} = H_1(A(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z}). \tag{5.1.4}$$

The $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})$ is equipped with a self-dual hermitian form defined exactly as for (5.1.1), now of signature $(n-1, 1)$. There is an alternate description of this hermitian form that will be useful later. Each of the homology groups in (5.1.4) is a self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module. Indeed, the polarization on $A_0$ induces a perfect $\mathbb{Z}$-valued symplectic form $\psi_0$ on $\mathfrak{A}_0$, and there is a unique hermitian form $h_{\mathfrak{A}_0}$ on $\mathfrak{A}_0$ satisfying

$$\psi_0(x, y) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\boldsymbol{k}/\mathbb{Q}} h_{\mathfrak{A}_0}(\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1} x, y),$$

where $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}} = \sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}$ is the square root lying in the upper half complex plane[3]. Similarly $\mathfrak{A}$ is equipped with a perfect symplectic form $\psi$, and a hermitian form $h_{\mathfrak{A}}$ satisfying

$$\psi(x, y) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\boldsymbol{k}/\mathbb{Q}} h_{\mathfrak{A}}(\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1} x, y). \tag{5.1.5}$$

The hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules $\mathfrak{A}_0$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ have signatures $(1, 0)$ and $(n-1, 1)$, and, in the notation of (2.1.2), there is an isomorphism of hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules

$$L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}).$$

The following is a slight refinement of Proposition 2.13(ii) of [KR2].

**Proposition 5.1.10.** *For every algebraically closed field $\mathbb{F}$ and every $(A_0, A) \in \mathtt{M}(\mathbb{F})$, there is a unique incoherent self-dual hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)$ of signature $(n, 0)$ satisfying*

$$\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)_\ell \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\ell}}(T_\ell(A_0), T_\ell(A))$$

*for every prime $\ell \neq \mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F})$. Furthermore, $\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)$ depends only on the connected component of $\mathtt{M}$ containing $(A_0, A)$, and not on $(A_0, A)$ itself.*

---

[3] More precisely, there is a choice of $i = \sqrt{-1}$ such that $\psi_0(ix, x)$ and $\psi(ix, x)$ are positive definite, and we choose $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ to lie in the same connected component of $\mathbb{C} \smallsetminus \mathbb{R}$ as $i$

*Proof.* First we prove uniqueness. If $\mathbb{F}$ has characteristic 0 then there is nothing to prove, as the stated conditions determine $\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)$ locally at every place of $\mathbb{Q}$. Assume instead that $\mathbb{F}$ has characteristic $p > 0$, and that $\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)$ and $\mathscr{L}'(A_0, A)$ both satisfy the stated properties. In particular $\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)_\ell \cong \mathscr{L}'(A_0, A)_\ell$ for all places $\ell \neq p$, including the archimedean place. The incoherence condition then forces

$$\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{Q}_p \cong \mathscr{L}'(A_0, A)_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{Q}_p.$$

By a result of Jacobowitz [Jac] this $\boldsymbol{k}_p$-hermitian space contains at most one isomorphism class of self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules[4], and so $\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)_p \cong \mathscr{L}'(A_0, A)_p$.

For existence, suppose first that $\mathbb{F}$ has characteristic 0. It suffices to treat the case $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$. We have no choice but to take $\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)_\ell \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\ell}}(T_\ell(A_0), T_\ell(A))$ at all finite primes, and must take $\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)_\infty$ to have signature $(n, 0)$. The only thing to check is that the resulting $\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)$ is incoherent. On the one hand, in the notation of (5.1.4), there is an isomorphism

$$L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \widehat{\mathbb{Z}} \cong \mathscr{L}(A_0, A)_f. \tag{5.1.6}$$

On the other hand, $L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})$ has signature $(n-1, 1)$, while $\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)$ has signature $(n, 0)$. Thus the local invariants of $L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{A}$ and $\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)$ differ at exactly the archimedean place, and the coherence of the former implies the incoherence of the latter.

Now take $\mathbb{F}$ to be arbitrary and let $R$ be the completed étale local ring of $\mathtt{M}$ at $(A_0, A)$, so that $R$ is a strictly Henselian local domain with residue field $\mathbb{F}$, and comes with a lift $(\tilde{A}_0, \tilde{A}) \in \mathtt{M}(R)$ of $(A_0, A)$ to $R$. The flatness of $\mathtt{M}$ implies that the fraction field $F = \mathrm{Frac}(R)$ has characteristic zero, and so from the paragraph above we know the existence of the hermitian $(k_\infty, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L}(\tilde{A}_{0/F^{\mathrm{alg}}}, \tilde{A}_{/F^{\mathrm{alg}}})$. One easily checks that

$$\mathscr{L}(A_0, A) = \mathscr{L}(\tilde{A}_{0/F^{\mathrm{alg}}}, \tilde{A}_{/F^{\mathrm{alg}}})$$

satisfies all the desired properties. Moreover, the pair $(\tilde{A}_{0/F^{\mathrm{alg}}}, \tilde{A}_{/F^{\mathrm{alg}}}) \in \mathtt{M}(F^{\mathrm{alg}})$ is the pullback of the universal object via the generic geometric point $\mathrm{Spec}(F^{\mathrm{alg}}) \to \mathtt{M}$, and so depends only on the connected component containing $(A_0, A)$. Hence the same is true of $\mathscr{L}(A_0, A)$. □

From Proposition 5.1.10 we obtain a decomposition

$$\mathtt{M} = \bigsqcup_{\mathscr{L}} \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}} \tag{5.1.7}$$

where $\mathscr{L}$ runs over all incoherent self-dual hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-modules of signature $(n, 0)$, and $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ is the union of those connected components of $\mathtt{M}$ for which $\mathscr{L}(A_0, A) \cong \mathscr{L}$ at every geometric point $(A_0, A)$. By setting $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m, \mathfrak{r}) = \mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r}) \times_{\mathtt{M}} \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ we obtain a similar decomposition

$$\mathtt{Z}(m, \mathfrak{r}) = \bigsqcup_{\mathscr{L}} \mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m, \mathfrak{r}).$$

5.2. **CM cycles.** For an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-scheme $S$, an $S$-valued point

$$(A_1, B) \in (\mathtt{M}_{(0,1)} \times_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \mathtt{M}_{(n-1,0)})(S)$$

determines an $S$-valued point $A_1 \times B \in \mathtt{M}_{(n-1,1)}(S)$, where $A_1 \times B$ is implicitly endowed with the product polarization, the product action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and the $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-stable $\mathcal{O}_S$-submodule

---

[4] See also Proposition 2.15 of [KR2]. We are using here the hypothesis that $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is odd.

$\mathrm{Lie}(B) \subset \mathrm{Lie}(A_1 \times B)$ satisfying Krämer's signature $(n-1,1)$ condition. In other words, the construction $(A_1, B) \mapsto A_1 \times B$ defines a morphism

$$\mathtt{M}_{(0,1)} \times_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \mathtt{M}_{(n-1,0)} \to \mathtt{M}_{(n-1,1)}.$$

The algebraic stack

$$\mathtt{Y} = \mathtt{M}_{(1,0)} \times_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \mathtt{M}_{(0,1)} \times_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \mathtt{M}_{(n-1,0)}$$

is smooth and proper of relative dimension 0 over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and admits a finite and unramified morphism $\mathtt{Y} \to \mathtt{M}$ defined by $(A_0, A_1, B) \mapsto (A_0, A_1 \times B)$. The algebraic stack $\mathtt{Y}$ is a *CM cycle*, in the sense that for any triple $(A_0, A_1, B) \in \mathtt{Y}(S)$ the entries $A_0$ and $A_1$ are elliptic curves with complex multiplication, while $B$ is isogenous to a product of elliptic curves with complex multiplication.

For any $S$-valued point $(A_0, A_1, B) \in \mathtt{Y}(S)$ there is an orthogonal decomposition

$$L(A_0, A_1 \times B) \cong L(A_0, A_1) \oplus L(A_0, B), \tag{5.2.1}$$

where $L(A_0, A_1) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(A_0, A_1)$ and $L(A_0, B) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(A_0, B)$.

**Lemma 5.2.1.** *Let $\tilde{S}$ be an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-scheme, and let $S \hookrightarrow \tilde{S}$ a closed subscheme defined by a nilpotent ideal sheaf. Suppose $k$ and $\ell$ are positive integers. Every pair*

$$(B_1, B_2) \in \left(\mathtt{M}_{(k,0)} \times_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \mathtt{M}_{(\ell,0)}\right)(S)$$

*admits a unique deformation to an $\tilde{S}$-valued point*

$$(\tilde{B}_1, \tilde{B}_2) \in \left(\mathtt{M}_{(k,0)} \times_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \mathtt{M}_{(\ell,0)}\right)(\tilde{S}),$$

*and the restriction map*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(\tilde{B}_1, \tilde{B}_2) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(B_1, B_2)$$

*is an isomorphism.*

*Proof.* The analogous statement for $p$-divisible groups, proved using Grothendieck-Messing theory and assuming that $p$ is locally nilpotent on $S$, is [Ho2, Proposition 2.4.1]. To prove the lemma, combine the argument of [*loc. cit.*] with the proof of [Ho3, Proposition 2.1.2], which is based instead on algebraic de Rham cohomology, and so is valid for abelian schemes over an arbitrary base. □

**Proposition 5.2.2.** *Let $S = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F})$ be the spectrum of an algebraically closed field, and suppose $(A_0, A_1, B) \in \mathtt{Y}(\mathbb{F})$.*

1. *There is a unique incoherent self-dual hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L}_0(A_0, A_1)$ of signature $(1,0)$ satisfying*

   $$\mathscr{L}_0(A_0, A_1)_\ell \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\ell}}(T_\ell(A_0), T_\ell(A_1))$$

   *for every prime $\ell \neq \mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F})$.*
2. *The hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module $L(A_0, B)$ is self-dual of signature $(n-1, 0)$.*

*Moreover, the modules $\mathscr{L}_0(A_0, A_1)$ and $L(A_0, B)$ depend only the connected component of $\mathtt{Y}$ containing $(A_0, A_1, B)$, and not on the point $(A_0, A_1, B)$ itself.*

*Proof.* The claims concerning $(A_0, A_1)$ are exactly as in Proposition 5.1.10, and we omit their identical proofs. For the pair $(A_0, B)$, first suppose that $\mathbb{F}$ has characteristic 0, in which case we may assume that $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$. As in the discussion following (5.1.4), the $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules $\mathfrak{A}_0 = H_1(A_0(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z})$ and $\mathfrak{B} = H_1(B(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z})$ come equipped with hermitian forms of signatures $(1,0)$ and $(n-1,0)$, respectively. It follows from the signature conditions on $A_0$ and $B$ that

$$A_0(\mathbb{C}) \cong \mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{R}}/\mathfrak{A}_0$$
$$B(\mathbb{C}) \cong \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathfrak{B},$$

where the complex structure on the right hand side of each isomorphism is determined by the natural action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{C}$. It follows that $L(A_0, B) \cong L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{B})$, and elementary linear algebra shows that the right hand side is self-dual of signature $(n-1,0)$.

For the case of arbitrary $\mathbb{F}$, let $R$ be the completed étale local ring of $\mathtt{Y}$ at the geometric point $(A_0, A_1, B)$. As $\mathtt{Y}$ is smooth of relative dimension 0 over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, the fraction field $F = \mathrm{Frac}(R)$ has characteristic 0, and there is a canonical point $(\tilde{A}_0, \tilde{B}) \in \mathtt{Y}(R)$ lifting $(A_0, B)$. From the characteristic 0 case just treated, we know that $L(\tilde{A}_{0/F^{\mathrm{alg}}}, \tilde{B}_{/F^{\mathrm{alg}}})$ is self-dual of signature $(n-1,0)$. It is easy to see from Lemma 5.2.1 and, for example, [FGA, Corollary 8.4.7] that the reduction map $L(\tilde{A}_0, \tilde{B}) \to L(A_0, B)$ is an isomorphism. Composing its inverse with base change to $F^{\mathrm{alg}}$ yields an isomorphism $L(A_0, B) \cong L(\tilde{A}_{0/F^{\mathrm{alg}}}, \tilde{B}_{/F^{\mathrm{alg}}})$, which shows that $L(A_0, B)$ is self-dual of signature $(n-1,0)$.

The proof that $L(A_0, B)$ is constant on connected components is exactly as in the proof of Proposition 5.1.10. □

From Proposition 5.2.2 we have a decomposition

$$\mathtt{Y} = \bigsqcup_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)}, \tag{5.2.2}$$

where the indices run over all isomorphism classes of pairs $(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)$ consisting of

- an incoherent self-dual hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L}_0$ of signature $(1,0)$,
- a self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module $\Lambda$ of signature $(n-1,0)$.

The stack $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)}$ is the union of those connected components of $\mathtt{Y}$ along which $\mathscr{L}_0(A_0, A_1) \cong \mathscr{L}_0$ and $L(A_0, B) \cong \Lambda$.

*Remark* 5.2.3. From (5.1.7) we obtain a decomposition

$$\mathtt{Y} = \bigsqcup_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)}.$$

Moreover, each pair $(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)$ as above determines an incoherent self-dual $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L}_0 \oplus \Lambda$ of signature $(n,0)$, whose infinite and finite parts are, by definition,

$$(\mathscr{L}_0 \oplus \Lambda)_\infty = \mathscr{L}_{0,\infty} \oplus (\Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R})$$
$$(\mathscr{L}_0 \oplus \Lambda)_f = \mathscr{L}_{0,f} \oplus (\Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}).$$

If we fix one pair $(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)$ and set $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{L}_0 \oplus \Lambda$, the morphism $\mathtt{Y} \to \mathtt{M}$ restricts to a morphism $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)} \to \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$.

## 5.3. **Decomposition of the intersection.**

In this subsection and the next, fix one $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)}$ as in (5.2.2), and set $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{L}_0 \oplus \Lambda$ as in Remark 5.2.3. From the preceeding subsections we have a cartesian diagram (this is the definition of the upper left corner)

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m, \mathfrak{r}) \cap \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)} \arrow[d] \\
\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m, \mathfrak{r}) \arrow[r] & \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Our goal is to decompose the intersection $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})\cap\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ into smaller, more manageable substacks.

Given $m_1,m_2\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathfrak{r}\mid\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, denote by $\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r})$ the algebraic stack over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ whose functor of points assigns to a connected $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-scheme $S$ the groupoid of tuples $(A_0,A_1,B,\lambda_1,\lambda_2)$ in which

- $(A_0,A_1,B)\in\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(S)$,
- $\lambda_1\in\mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0,A_1)$ satisfies $\langle\lambda_1,\lambda_1\rangle=m_1$,
- $\lambda_2\in\mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0,B)$ satisfies $\langle\lambda_2,\lambda_2\rangle=m_2$,

and the map $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda_1 : A_0\to A_1$ induces the trivial map

$$\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda_1 : \mathrm{Lie}(A_0)\to\mathrm{Lie}(A_1) \tag{5.3.1}$$

for any generator $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. As in Remark 5.1.7, this last condition is automatically satisfied if $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r})\in\mathcal{O}_S^\times$.

**Proposition 5.3.1.** *For every $m\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and every $\mathfrak{r}\mid\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, there is an isomorphism of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-stacks*

$$\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})\cap\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}\cong\bigsqcup_{\substack{m_1,m_2\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}\\ m_1+m_2=m}}\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r}). \tag{5.3.2}$$

*Proof.* Suppose $S$ is a connected $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-scheme. An $S$-valued point on the right hand side of (5.3.2) consists of a triple

$$(A_0,A,\lambda)\in\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})(S)$$

and a triple

$$(A_0,A_1,B)\in\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(S)$$

together with an isomorphism $A\cong A_1\times B$ identifying $\mathrm{Lie}(B)$ with the subsheaf $\mathcal{F}\subset\mathrm{Lie}(A)$. Under the orthogonal decomposition (5.2.1), $\lambda\in\mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0,A)$ decomposes as

$$\lambda=\lambda_1+\lambda_2\in\mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0,A_1)\oplus\mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0,B)$$

in such a way that $\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle=\langle\lambda_1,\lambda_1\rangle+\langle\lambda_2,\lambda_2\rangle$. If we set $m_1=\langle\lambda_1,\lambda_1\rangle$ and $m_2=\langle\lambda_2,\lambda_2\rangle$ then the quintuple $(A_0,A_1,B,\lambda_1,\lambda_2)$ defines an $S$-valued point of $\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r})$. This defines the desired isomorphism. □

Now we completely determine the structure of the stacks appearing in the right hand side of (5.3.2). We will see momentarily that each has dimension 0 or 1, depending on whether $m_1>0$ or $m_1=0$. For any $m\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ and any $\mathfrak{r}\mid\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, define the *representation number*

$$R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})=\big|\{\lambda\in\mathfrak{r}^{-1}\Lambda:\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle=m\}\big|. \tag{5.3.3}$$

For $m\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ define a finite set of odd cardinality

$$\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m)=\{\text{primes } p \text{ of } \mathbb{Q}:\ m \text{ is not represented by } \mathscr{V}_{0,p}\}, \tag{5.3.4}$$

and note that every $p\in\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m)$ is nonsplit in $\boldsymbol{k}$.

**Theorem 5.3.2.** *Fix $m_1,m_2\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ with $m_1>0$, and $\mathfrak{r}\mid\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. Abbreviate*

$$\mathtt{X}=\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r}).$$

(1) *If $|\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1)|>1$, then $\mathtt{X}=\emptyset$.*

(2) *If* $\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1) = \{p\}$*, then* $\mathtt{X}$ *has dimension* $0$ *and is supported in characteristic* $p$*. Furthermore, the étale local ring of every geometric point of* $\mathtt{X}$ *has length*

$$\nu_p(m_1) = \mathrm{ord}_p(pm_1) \cdot \begin{cases} 1/2 & \textit{if } p \textit{ is inert in } \boldsymbol{k}, \\ 1 & \textit{if } p \textit{ is ramified in } \boldsymbol{k}, \end{cases}$$

*and the number of geometric points of* $\mathtt{X}$ *(counted with multiplicities) is*

$$\sum_{z \in \mathtt{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})} \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Aut}(z)|} = \frac{h_{\boldsymbol{k}}}{w_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \cdot \frac{R_\Lambda(m_2, \mathfrak{r})}{|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda)|} \cdot \rho\left(\frac{m_1 \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{s})}{p^\epsilon}\right) \tag{5.3.5}$$

*where* $\mathfrak{p}$ *is the unique prime of* $\boldsymbol{k}$ *above* $p$*,* $\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}}$ *is an algebraic closure of its residue field,* $\rho$ *is defined by (1.5.1),* $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{r}/(\mathfrak{r} + \mathfrak{p})$ *is the prime-to-*$\mathfrak{p}$ *part of* $\mathfrak{r}$*, and*

$$\epsilon = \begin{cases} 1 & \textit{if } p \textit{ is inert in } \boldsymbol{k}, \\ 0 & \textit{if } p \textit{ is ramified in } \boldsymbol{k}. \end{cases} \tag{5.3.6}$$

*Proof.* If $\mathtt{X} \neq \emptyset$ then there is some point $(A_0, A_1, B, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathtt{X}(\mathbb{F})$, where $\mathbb{F}$ is either $\mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{F}_p^{\mathrm{alg}}$ for some prime $p$. Let $\overline{A}_1$ be the elliptic curve $A_1$, but with the action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ replaced by its complex conjugate. Thus $\lambda_1 : A_0 \to \overline{A}_1$ is an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-*conjugate*-linear degree $m_1$ quasi-isogeny between elliptic curves with complex multiplication, and $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ acts on the Lie algebras of $A_0$ and $\overline{A}_1$ through the *same* homomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \to \mathbb{F}$. The only way such a conjugate linear quasi-isogeny can exist is if $\mathbb{F}$ has nonzero characteristic, $p$ is nonsplit in $\boldsymbol{k}$, and $A_0$ and $A_1$ are supersingular elliptic curves. In particular

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}_\ell}(T_\ell(A_0), T_\ell(A_1)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(A_0, A_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_\ell$$

for every prime $\ell \neq p$, and hence also

$$\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell} \cong \mathscr{L}_0(A_0, A_1)_\ell \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\ell}}(T_\ell(A_0), T_\ell(A_1)) \cong L(A_0, A_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_\ell$$

as hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\ell}$-modules. As $\langle \lambda_1, \lambda_1 \rangle = m_1$ by definition of the moduli space $\mathtt{X}$, we have now shown that $\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}$ represents $m_1$ for all finite primes $\ell \neq p$. Therefore $\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1)$ contains at most one prime, $p$. We have already remarked that this set has odd cardinality, and therefore $\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1) = \{p\}$.

We interrupt the proof for a lemma.

**Lemma 5.3.3.** *The étale local ring of* $\mathtt{X}$ *at every point*

$$(A_0, A_1, B, x_1, x_2) \in \mathtt{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})$$

*is Artinian of length* $\nu_p(m_1)$*.*

*Proof.* We reduce the proof to calculations of Gross [Gr]. The tuple $(A_0, A_1, B, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ corresponds to a morphism $z : \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}}) \to \mathtt{X}$, and by composing with the structure morphism we obtain a geometric point $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}}) \to \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$. Let $W$ be the completion of the étale local ring of $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$ at this point. In less fancy language, $W$ is the completion of the integer ring of the maximal unramified extension of $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Let $R$ be the completed étale local ring of $\mathtt{X}$ at $(A_0, A_1, B, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$. This ring pro-represents the deformation functor of the tuple $(A_0, A_1, B, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ to Artinian local $W$-algebras with residue field $\mathbb{F}$. Lemma 5.2.1 implies that $(A_0, B, \lambda_2)$ admits a unique lift to any such $W$-algebra. Thus the data of $B$ and $\lambda_2$ can be ignored in the deformation problem, and $R$ pro-represents the deformation functor of $(A_0, A_1, \lambda_1)$. Equivalently, $R$ pro-represents the deformation functor of $(A_0, \overline{A}_1, \lambda_1)$.

By the Serre-Tate theorem we may replace $A_0$ and $\overline{A}_1$ in the above deformation problem by their $p$-divisible groups, which are $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},p}$-linearly isomorphic. Let $G$ be the connected $p$-divisible group of height 2 and dimension 1 over $\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}}$, and fix an action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},p}$ on $G$ such that the induced action on $\mathrm{Lie}(G)$ is through the structure morphism $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\mathfrak{p}} \to \mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}}$. Let

$$\lambda_1 \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}\,\mathrm{End}(G)$$

be an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},p}$-conjugate-linear map such that $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda_1 : G \to G$ induces the trivial map on Lie algebras. The quasi-endomorphism $\lambda$ satisfies

$$\mathrm{ord}_p(\mathrm{Nrd}(\lambda)) = \mathrm{ord}_p(m_1)$$

where Nrd is the reduced norm on the quaternion order $\mathrm{End}(G)$, and $R$ pro-represents the functor that assigns to every Artinian local $W$-algebra with residue field $\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}}$ the set of deformations $(\tilde{G}, \tilde{\lambda})$ of $(G, \lambda)$ with $\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}\,\mathrm{End}(\tilde{G})$ and

$$\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\tilde{\lambda} : \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{G}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{G}) \tag{5.3.7}$$

equal to zero.

Suppose first that $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^{\times}$. Then $\lambda_1 \in \mathrm{End}(G)$, and Remark 5.1.7 implies that the vanishing of (5.3.7) is automatically satisfied for any deformation. In this case, Gross's results immediately imply that $R$ is Artinian of length $\nu_p(m_1)$.

Now suppose $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r}) \notin \mathbb{Z}_p^{\times}$, so that $\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\mathfrak{p}}$. If we set $y = \delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda_1 \in \mathrm{End}(G)$, then the ring $R$ pro-represents the functor that assigns to every Artinian local $W$-algebra with residue field $\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}}$ the set of deformations $(\tilde{G}, \tilde{y})$ with $\tilde{y} \in \mathrm{End}(\tilde{G})$ and $\tilde{y} : \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{G}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{G})$ equal to zero. Let $R'$ be the ring pro-representing the same deformation problem, but without the condition that $\tilde{y} : \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{G}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{G})$ vanish. By Gross's results $R' \cong W/\mathfrak{p}^{k+1}$, where

$$k = \mathrm{ord}_p(\mathrm{Nrd}(y)) = \nu_p(m_1).$$

Let $(G_{k+1}, y_{k+1})$ be the universal deformation of $(G, y)$ to $W/\mathfrak{p}^{k+1}$, and let $(G_k, y_k)$ be its reduction to $W/\mathfrak{p}^k$. To show that $R \cong W/\mathfrak{p}^k$ it suffices to prove that

$$y_{k+1} : \mathrm{Lie}(G_{k+1}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(G_{k+1}) \tag{5.3.8}$$

is nonzero, but that

$$y_k : \mathrm{Lie}(G_k) \to \mathrm{Lie}(G_k) \tag{5.3.9}$$

vanishes.

For any $\ell$, let $G_\ell$ denote the canonical lift[5] of $G$ to $R_\ell = W/\mathfrak{p}^\ell$, and let $D(G_\ell)$ be the Grothendieck-Messing crystal of $G_\ell$ evaluated at $R_\ell$. Thus $D(G_\ell)$ is a free $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} R_\ell$-module of rank one, and sits in an exact sequence free $R_\ell$-modules

$$0 \to \mathrm{Fil}^1 D(G_\ell) \to D(G_\ell) \to \mathrm{Lie}(G_\ell) \to 0.$$

As in the proof of Proposition 5.1.9, $\mathrm{Fil}^1 D(G_\ell) = J D(G_\ell)$, where $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} = \mathbb{Z}[\Pi]$ and

$$J = \Pi \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \Pi \in \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} R_\ell$$

generates (as an $R_\ell$-module), the kernel of the natural map $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} R_\ell \to R_\ell$. Note that the image of

$$\overline{J} = \overline{\Pi} \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \Pi \in \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} R_\ell$$

in $R_\ell$ is $\overline{\Pi} - \Pi$, which generates the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}R_\ell$.

---

[5] in the sense of [Gr], so $G_\ell$ is the unique defomation of $G$, with its action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\mathfrak{p}}$, to $R_\ell$

Suppose we are given an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-conjugate-linear endomorphism $y_{\ell-1} \in \mathrm{End}(G_{\ell-1})$. By Grothendieck-Messing theory, such an endomorphism induces an endomorphism $\tilde{y}_{\ell-1}$ of $D(G_\ell)$, and $y_{\ell-1}$ lifts to $\mathrm{End}(G_\ell)$ if and only if the composition

$$\mathrm{Fil}^1 D(G_\ell) \to D(G_\ell) \xrightarrow{\tilde{y}_{\ell-1}} D(G_\ell) \to \mathrm{Lie}(G_\ell)$$

is trivial. It is now easy to see that each of the following statements is equivalent to the next one:

1. $y_{\ell-1}$ lifts to $\mathrm{End}(G_\ell)$,
2. the image of $\tilde{y}_{\ell-1}(JD(G_\ell)) = \overline{J}y_\ell(D(G_\ell))$ in $\mathrm{Lie}(G_\ell)$ is trivial,
3. the image of $\tilde{y}_{\ell-1}(D(G_\ell))$ in $\mathrm{Lie}(G_\ell)$ lies in $\mathfrak{p}^{\ell-1}\mathrm{Lie}(G_\ell)$,
4. the composition
$$D(G_\ell) \xrightarrow{\tilde{y}_{\ell-1}} D(G_\ell) \to \mathrm{Lie}(G_\ell) \to \mathrm{Lie}(G_{\ell-1})$$
vanishes,
5. the composition
$$D(G_{\ell-1}) \xrightarrow{y_{\ell-1}} D(G_{\ell-1}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(G_{\ell-1})$$
vanishes,
6. $y_{\ell-1} : \mathrm{Lie}(G_{\ell-1}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(G_{\ell-1})$ is trivial.

Thus $y_{\ell-1}$ lifts to $\mathrm{End}(G_\ell)$ if and only if it induces the zero endomorphism of $\mathrm{Lie}(G_{\ell-1})$, and the nonvanishing of (5.3.8) and vanishing of (5.3.9) follow immediately. ☐

To complete the proof of Theorem 5.3.2, it only remains to prove (5.3.5). We do this through a sequence of lemmas.

**Lemma 5.3.4.** *Abbreviating* $\mathtt{Y} = \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$, *we have*

$$\sum_{z\in\mathtt{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})} \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Aut}(z)|} = \sum_{L_0} \sum_{\substack{(A_0,A_1,B)\in\mathtt{Y}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}}) \\ L(A_0,A_1)\cong L_0}} \frac{R_{L_0}(m_1,\mathfrak{s})R_\Lambda(m_2,\mathfrak{r})}{|\operatorname{Aut}(A_0,A_1,B)|}, \tag{5.3.10}$$

*where the outer sum on the right is over all hermitian* $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$*-modules* $L_0$ *of rank one, and the representation number* $R_{L_0}(m_1,\mathfrak{s})$ *is defined in the same way as (5.3.3).*

*Proof.* Directly from the definitions, we have

$$\sum_{z\in\mathtt{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})} \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Aut}(z)|} = \sum_{(A_0,A_1,B)\in\mathtt{Y}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1\in\mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0,A_1) \\ \langle\lambda_1,\lambda_1\rangle=m_1 \\ \mathrm{Lie}(\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda_1)=0}} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_2\in\mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0,B) \\ \langle\lambda_2,\lambda_2\rangle=m_2}} \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Aut}(A_0,A_1,B)|},$$

where the condition $\mathrm{Lie}(\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda_1) = 0$ refers to the vanishing of (5.3.1).

We claim that

$$\{\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0,A_1) : \mathrm{Lie}(\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda) = 0\} = \mathfrak{s}^{-1}L(A_0,A_1)$$

for all $A_0 \in \mathtt{M}_{(1,0)}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})$ and $A_1 \in \mathtt{M}_{(0,1)}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})$. If $\lambda \in \mathfrak{s}^{-1}L(A_0,A_1)$ then, as $\mathfrak{s}$ is prime to $\mathfrak{p}$, $\lambda$ induces a morphism of Lie algebras $\lambda : \mathrm{Lie}(A_0) \to \mathrm{Lie}(A_1)$. By the argument of Remark 5.1.7, the image of this map is annihilated by $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and so $\mathrm{Lie}(\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda) = 0$. Conversely, suppose we start with $\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0,A_1)$ satisfying $\mathrm{Lie}(\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda) = 0$. Let $G$ be the connected $p$-divisible group of height 2 and dimension 1, and set $\mathcal{O}_B = \mathrm{End}(G)$. Thus $\mathcal{O}_B$ is the maximal order in a quaternion division algebra over $\mathbb{Q}_p$. We may fix an embedding $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},p} \to \mathrm{End}(G)$ and isomorphisms $A_0[p^\infty] \cong G \cong A_1[p^\infty]$ in such a way that the first is $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},p}$-linear, and the second is $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},p}$-conjugate-linear. The hypothesis $\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0, A_1)$ implies that $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda \in \mathcal{O}_B$, but we cannot have $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda \in \mathcal{O}_B^\times$ (for then $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda$, and also $\mathrm{Lie}(\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda)$, would be an isomorphism). Therefore $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda$ lies in the unique maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_B$, and hence $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}_B$. This implies that

$$\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0, A_1) \cap \mathrm{Hom}(A_0[p^\infty], A_1[p^\infty]) = \mathfrak{s}^{-1}L(A_0, A_1)$$

as desired.

We have now shown that

$$\sum_{z \in \mathtt{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})} \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Aut}(z)|} = \sum_{(A_0,A_1,B)\in \mathtt{Y}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1 \in \mathfrak{s}^{-1}L(A_0,A_1) \\ \langle \lambda_1, \lambda_1\rangle = m_1}} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_2 \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_0,B) \\ \langle \lambda_2, \lambda_2\rangle = m_2}} \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Aut}(A_0, A_1, B)|}.$$

On the right hand side, each $L(A_0, A_1)$ is a hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module of rank one, while $L(A_0, B) \cong \Lambda$. The lemma follows immediately. □

Let $\mathscr{V}_0$ be the incoherent hermitian space over $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ determined by $\mathscr{L}_0$, and recall from Remark 2.1.2 that for every prime $p$ nonsplit in $\boldsymbol{k}$ there is a coherent hermitian space $\mathscr{V}_0(p)$, which is isomorphic to $\mathscr{V}_0$ everywhere locally away from $p$. We now repeat this construction on the level of $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-modules. Define a new hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L}_0(p)$ by setting $\mathscr{L}_0(p)_\ell = \mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}$ for every place $\ell \neq p$. For the $p$-component $\mathscr{L}_0(p)_p$, take the same underlying $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},p}$-module as $\mathscr{L}_{0,p}$, but replace the hermitian form $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathscr{L}_{0,p}}$ on $\mathscr{L}_{0,p}$ with the hermitian form

$$\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathscr{L}_0(p)_p} = c_p \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathscr{L}_{0,p}},$$

where

$$c_p = \begin{cases} \text{any uniformizing parameter of } \mathbb{Z}_p, & \text{if } p \text{ is inert in } \boldsymbol{k}, \\ \text{any element of } \mathbb{Z}_p^\times \text{ that is not a norm from } \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},p}^\times, & \text{if } p \text{ is ramified in } \boldsymbol{k}. \end{cases}$$

The resulting coherent $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L}_0(p)$ has $\mathscr{V}_0(p)$ as its associated hermitian $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module. Note that if $p$ is inert in $\boldsymbol{k}$ then $\mathscr{L}_0(p)$ is not self-dual.

**Lemma 5.3.5.** *Any triple $(A_0, A_1, B)$ appearing in the final sum of (5.3.10) satisfies*

$$L(A_0, A_1) \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(p)).$$

*Proof.* It is easy to see that

$$\mathscr{L}_0(p)_\ell \cong \mathscr{L}_{0,\ell} \cong \mathscr{L}_0(A_0, A_1)_\ell \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\ell}}(T_\ell(A_0), T_\ell(A_1)) \cong L(A_0, A_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_\ell$$

for all primes $\ell \neq p$, and that

$$\mathscr{L}_0(p)_\infty \cong L(A_0, A_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R},$$

as both sides are positive definite. In particular the coherent $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-hermitian spaces $\mathscr{V}_0(p)$ and $L(A_0, A_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{A}$ are isomorphic at all places away from $p$, and by comparing invariants we see that

$$\mathscr{V}_0(p)_p \cong L(A_0, A_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}_p \tag{5.3.11}$$

as $\boldsymbol{k}_p$-hermitian spaces. In order to strengthen (5.3.11) to an isomorphism

$$\mathscr{L}_0(p)_p \cong L(A_0, A_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_p, \tag{5.3.12}$$

fix $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},p}$-module generators $x$ and $y$ of the left hand side and right hand side, respectively, of (5.3.12), and define $p$-adic integers $\alpha = \langle x, x\rangle$ and $\beta = \langle y, y\rangle$.

Let $G$ be the unique connected $p$-divisible group of height 2 over $\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}}$, and fix an action of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\mathfrak{p}}$ on $G$ in such a way that the induced action on $\mathrm{Lie}(G)$ is through the structure map

$\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\mathfrak{p}} \to \mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}}$. There is an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\mathfrak{p}}$-linear isomorphism $G \cong A_0[p^\infty]$, and an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\mathfrak{p}}$-*conjugate*-linear isomorphism $G \cong A_1[p^\infty]$. These choices identify $L(A_0, A_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_p$ with the submodule of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\mathfrak{p}}$-conjugate-linear endomorphisms

$$\mathrm{End}_{\overline{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k},\mathfrak{p}}}(G) \subset \mathrm{End}(G),$$

and identify the quadratic form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $L(A_0, A_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_p$ with a $\mathbb{Z}_p^\times$-multiple of the restriction to $\mathrm{End}_{\overline{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k},\mathfrak{p}}}(G)$ of the reduced norm on the quaternionic order $\mathrm{End}(G)$. A routine calculation with quaternion algebras, as in [KRY1, pp. 376–378], now implies that

$$\mathrm{ord}_p(\beta) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p \text{ is inert in } \boldsymbol{k}, \\ 0 & \text{if } p \text{ is ramified in } \boldsymbol{k}. \end{cases}$$

Comparing with the definition of $\mathscr{L}_0(p)$ then shows that $\mathrm{ord}_p(\alpha) = \mathrm{ord}_p(\beta)$. The isomorphism (5.3.11) implies that $\chi_{\boldsymbol{k},p}(\alpha) = \chi_{\boldsymbol{k},p}(\beta)$, and this information is enough to guarantee that $\alpha/\beta$ is a norm from $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\mathfrak{p}}^\times$. This proves (5.3.12), and completes the proof of the lemma. ☐

**Lemma 5.3.6.** *For each* $L_0 \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(p))$ *there are* $h_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ *isomorphism classes of triples* $(A_0, A_1, B) \in \mathtt{Y}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})$ *such that* $L(A_0, A_1) \cong L_0$. *Any such triple satisfies*

$$|\,\mathrm{Aut}(A_0, A_1, B)| = w_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2 \cdot |\,\mathrm{Aut}(\Lambda)|.$$

*Proof.* Let $R$ be any complete local Noetherian ring with residue $\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}}$. Using Lemma 5.2.1 and Grothendieck's formal existence theorem [FGA, Section 8.4.4], the triple $(A_0, A_1, B)$ lifts uniquely to $R$, as do all of its automorphisms. Using this, we are easily reduced to the corresponding counting problem in characteristic 0. The category $\mathtt{Y}(\mathbb{C})$ is easily described in terms of linear algebra (see Section 6.1 below). Briefly, there are $h_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ CM elliptic curves $A_0 \in \mathtt{M}_{(1,0)}(\mathbb{C})$, and for each such $A_0$ there is a unique CM elliptic curve $A_1 \in \mathtt{M}_{(0,1)}(\mathbb{C})$ satisfying $L(A_0, A) \cong L_0$, and a unique $B \in \mathtt{M}_{(n-1,0)}(\mathbb{C})$ satisfying $L(A_0, B) \cong \Lambda$. Each of $A_0$ and $A_1$ has automorphism group $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^\times$, and the automorphism group of $B$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Aut}(\Lambda)$. ☐

**Lemma 5.3.7.** *Still assuming that* $\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1) = \{p\}$, *we have*

$$\frac{1}{w_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \sum_{L_0 \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(p))} R_{L_0}(m_1, \mathfrak{s}) = \rho\left(\frac{m_1 \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{s})}{p^\epsilon}\right).$$

*Proof.* As $\mathscr{V}_0(p)$ is coherent, we may fix a hermitian space $V_0$ over $\boldsymbol{k}$ such that

$$V_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{A} \cong \mathscr{V}_0(p).$$

Note that $\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1) = \{p\}$ implies that $V_0$ represents $m_1$. Pick one vector $\lambda_0 \in V_0$ such that $\langle \lambda_0, \lambda_0 \rangle = m_1$, and an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-lattice $L_0 \subset V_0$ such that $L_0 \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(p))$.

Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{k}}^1$ denote the group of norm one elements in $\widehat{\boldsymbol{k}}^\times$, and define $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^1$ in the same way. As $h$ varies over $\widehat{\boldsymbol{k}}^1/\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^1$, the lattices $h \cdot L_0 \subset V_0$, with the hermitian forms restricted from $V_0$, vary over $\mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(p))$. Thus

$$\frac{1}{w_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \sum_{L_0 \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(p))} R_{L_0}(m_1, \mathfrak{s}) = \sum_{h \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{k}}^1/\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^1} \mathbf{1}_{h\mathfrak{s}^{-1}L_0}(\lambda_0),$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ denotes characteristic function. If we fix any $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-linear isomorphism $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \cong \widehat{L}_0$, the hermitian form on $L_0$ is identified with $\langle x, y\rangle = x\overline{y}p^{\epsilon}u$ for some $u \in \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{\times}$, and now

$$\frac{1}{w_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \sum_{L_0 \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(p))} R_{L_0}(m_1, \mathfrak{s}) = \sum_{h \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{k}}^1 / \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^1} \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(h^{-1} s \lambda_0)$$

where $\lambda_0 \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{k}}^{\times}$ satisfies $u\mathrm{N}(\lambda_0) = m_1/p^{\epsilon}$, and $s \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{k}}^{\times}$ satisfies $s\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}} = \widehat{\mathfrak{s}}$. The equality

$$\sum_{h \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{k}}^1 / \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^1} \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(h^{-1} s \lambda_0) = \rho\left(\frac{m_1 \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{s})}{p^{\epsilon}}\right)$$

is easily checked, as both sides admit a factorization over the prime numbers, and the prime-by-prime comparison is elementary. □

Combining (5.3.10) and the four lemmas shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{z \in \mathtt{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})} \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Aut}(z)|} &= \sum_{L_0 \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(p))} \sum_{\substack{(A_0, A_1, B) \in \mathtt{Y}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}}) \\ L(A_0, A_1) \cong L_0}} \frac{R_{L_0}(m_1, \mathfrak{s}) R_{\Lambda}(m_2, \mathfrak{r})}{|\operatorname{Aut}(A_0, A_1, B)|} \\
&= \frac{h_{\boldsymbol{k}}}{w_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2} \sum_{L_0 \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(p))} \frac{R_{L_0}(m_1, \mathfrak{s}) R_{\Lambda}(m_2, \mathfrak{r})}{|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda)|} \\
&= \frac{h_{\boldsymbol{k}}}{w_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \cdot \frac{R_{\Lambda}(m_2, \mathfrak{r})}{|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda)|} \cdot \rho\left(\frac{m_1 \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{s})}{p^{\epsilon}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and completes the proof of Theorem 5.3.2. □

Theorem 5.3.2 implies that $\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1, m_2, \mathfrak{r})$ has dimension 0 whenever $m_1 > 0$. Now we turn to the case of $m_1 = 0$.

**Proposition 5.3.8.** *Fix a positive $m \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathfrak{r} \mid \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$.*

1. *If $R_{\Lambda}(m, \mathfrak{r}) = 0$ then $\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(0, m, \mathfrak{r}) = \emptyset$.*
2. *If $R_{\Lambda}(m, \mathfrak{r}) \neq 0$ then $\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(0, m, \mathfrak{r})$ is nonempty, and is smooth of relative dimension 0 over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. In particular, it is a regular stack of dimension 1.*

*Proof.* We know from Proposition 5.1.3 that $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \to \operatorname{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$ is smooth of relative dimension 0, and Lemma 5.2.1 implies that the map $\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(0, m, \mathfrak{r}) \to \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ defined by

$$(A_0, A_1, B, 0, \lambda_2) \mapsto (A_0, A_1, B)$$

is formally étale. Hence the composition $\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(0, m, \mathfrak{r}) \to \operatorname{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$ is smooth of relative dimension 0.

It only remains to show that $\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(0, m, \mathfrak{r})$ is nonempty if and only if $R_{\Lambda}(m, \mathfrak{r}) \neq 0$. If $\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(0, m, \mathfrak{r})$ is nonempty then we may pick any geometric point

$$(A_0, A_1, B, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(0, m, \mathfrak{r})(\mathbb{F}).$$

Using $L(A_0, B) \cong \Lambda$, the homomorphism $\lambda_2$ defines an element of $\Lambda$ satisfying $\langle \lambda_2, \lambda_2 \rangle = m$, and in particular $R_{\Lambda}(m, \mathfrak{r}) \neq 0$. Conversely, if $R_{\Lambda}(m, \mathfrak{r}) \neq 0$ then pick some $\lambda_2 \in \Lambda$ satisfying $\langle \lambda_2, \lambda_2 \rangle = m$. It follows from the uniformization (6.1.5) below that $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C}) \neq \emptyset$, and for any choice of $(A_0, A_1, B) \in \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})$ the vector $\lambda_2$ defines an element of $\Lambda \cong L(A_0, B)$. Setting $\lambda_1 = 0$, the tuple $(A_0, A_1, B, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ defines a complex point of $\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(0, m, \mathfrak{r})$. □

*Remark* 5.3.9. It follows from (5.3.2) and Theorem 5.3.2 that if $R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})=0$, the intersection $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})\cap\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ is isomorphic to the zero dimensional stack

$$\bigsqcup_{\substack{m_1\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}\\ m_2\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}\\ m_1+m_2=m}} \mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r}). \tag{5.3.13}$$

On the other hand, if $R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})\neq 0$ then $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})\cap\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ is the disjoint union of the zero dimensional stack (5.3.13) with the one dimensional stack $\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(0,m,\mathfrak{r})$.

## 6. CM values of automorphic Green functions

As in Section 5.3, fix an $n\geq 2$ and a pair $(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)$ consisting of an incoherent self-dual hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_\mathbb{R},\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L}_0$ of signature $(1,0)$, and a self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module $\Lambda$ of signature $(n-1,0)$. As in Remark 5.2.3, define an incoherent self-dual hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_\mathbb{R},\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module of signature $(n,0)$ by

$$\mathscr{L}=\mathscr{L}_0\oplus\Lambda.$$

Let $\mathscr{L}(\infty)$ be the unique coherent self-dual hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_\mathbb{R},\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module of signature $(n-1,1)$ satisfying $\mathscr{L}(\infty)_f\cong\mathscr{L}_f$. In other words, $\mathscr{L}(\infty)$ is obtained from $\mathscr{L}$ by changing the signature at the archimedean place from $(n,0)$ to $(n-1,1)$. Similarly, let $\mathscr{L}_0(\infty)$ be obtained from $\mathscr{L}_0$ by switching the signature at the archimedean place from $(1,0)$ to $(0,1)$.

As in Section 1.5, the finite $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$ is equipped with a $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z}$-valued quadratic form $Q(x)=\langle x,x\rangle$, and we denote by $\Delta$ its automorphism group as a finite quadratic space. The space $S_\mathscr{L}$ of complex valued functions on $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$ is equipped with an action of $\Delta$ and a commuting action $\omega_\mathscr{L}$ of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ defined by the Weil representation. In particular, $\Delta$ acts on the space $H_{2-n}(\omega_\mathscr{L})$ of harmonic Maass forms with values in $S_\mathscr{L}$. In the exact same way the finite $\mathbb{Z}$-modules $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,f}/\mathscr{L}_{0,f}$ and $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\Lambda/\Lambda$ are equipped with quadratic forms (still denoted $Q$), and the spaces $S_{\mathscr{L}_0}$ and $S_\Lambda$ are equipped with actions $\omega_{\mathscr{L}_0}$ and $\omega_\Lambda$ of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. Moreover, the obvious isomorphism

$$S_\mathscr{L}\cong S_{\mathscr{L}_0}\otimes_\mathbb{C} S_\Lambda$$

is $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$-equivariant.

The purpose of this section is twofold. First, we describe the complex uniformizations of the orbifolds

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathtt{Z}_\mathscr{L}(m,\mathfrak{r})(\mathbb{C}) \arrow[r] & \mathtt{M}_\mathscr{L}(\mathbb{C}) & \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C}) \arrow[l] \end{tikzcd}$$

constructed in Section 5.1. Comparing these uniformizations with the complex Shimura varieties considered earlier will allow us to use the construction (3.3.1) to define Green functions for the divisors $\mathtt{Z}_\mathscr{L}(m,\mathfrak{r})$. More generally, we will associate to any $\Delta$-invariant harmonic Maass form $f\in H_{2-n}(\omega_\mathscr{L})$ a divisor $\mathtt{Z}_\mathscr{L}(f)$ and a Green function $\Phi_\mathscr{L}(f)$. The second purpose of this section is to find an explicit formula for the value of $\Phi_\mathscr{L}(f)$ at the complex points of $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$

6.1. **Complex uniformization.** Here we recall the uniformization of the smooth complex orbifold $\mathtt{M}_\mathscr{L}(\mathbb{C})$ and its Kudla-Rapoport divisors. The complex uniformization is explained in [KR2, Section 3] and [Ho2, Section 3.8], and so we only sketch the main ideas.

To each point $(A_0,A)\in\mathtt{M}_\mathscr{L}(\mathbb{C})$ there is an associated pair $(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})$ of self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules as in (5.1.4). As in (2.1.2) there is an associated self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module $L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})$ of signature $(n-1,1)$, and the isomorphism (5.1.6) implies that

$$L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})\in\mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}(\infty)).$$

The pair $(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})$ depends on the connected component of $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$ containing $(A_0, A)$, but not on $(A_0, A)$ itself, and the formation of $(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})$ from $(A_0, A)$ establishes a bijection from the set of connected components of $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ to the set of isomorphism classes of pairs $(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})$ in which

- $\mathfrak{A}_0$ is a self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module of signature $(1, 0)$,
- $\mathfrak{A}$ is a self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module of signature $(n-1, 1)$,
- $L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \in \operatorname{gen}(\mathscr{L}(\infty))$.

*Remark* 6.1.1. For each $L \in \operatorname{gen}(\mathscr{L}(\infty))$ there are exactly $h_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ pairs $(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})$ as above satisfying $L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \cong L$. Indeed, there are $h_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ choices of $\mathfrak{A}_0$, and for each choice there is a unique $\mathfrak{A}$ for which $L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \cong L$.

We now give an explicit parametrization of the connected component of $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$ indexed by one pair $(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})$. Let $\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})}$ be the space of negative $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$-lines in $L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})_{\mathbb{R}}$. The group

$$\Gamma_{(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})} = \operatorname{Aut}(\mathfrak{A}_0) \times \operatorname{Aut}(\mathfrak{A})$$

sits in a short exact sequence

$$1 \to \mu(\boldsymbol{k}) \to \Gamma_{(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})} \to \operatorname{Aut}(L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})) \to 1 \tag{6.1.1}$$

in which the arrow $\mu(\boldsymbol{k}) \to \Gamma_{(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})}$ is the diagonal inclusion, and $\Gamma_{(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})} \to \operatorname{Aut}(L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}))$ sends $(\gamma_0, \gamma)$ to the automorphism $\lambda \mapsto \gamma \circ \lambda \circ \gamma_0^{-1}$. In particular, $\Gamma_{(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})}$ acts on $\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})}$.

There is a morphism of $(n-1)$-dimensional orbifolds

$$\Gamma_{(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})} \backslash \mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})} \to \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$$

defined by sending the negative line $z \in \mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})}$ to the pair $(A_0, A_z)$, where $A_0(\mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{R}}/\mathfrak{A}_0$ and $A_z(\mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{A}_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathfrak{A}$ as real Lie groups with $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-actions. The complex structure on $A_0(\mathbb{C})$ is defined by the natural action of $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{C}$ on $\mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{R}}$, but the complex structure on $A_z(\mathbb{C})$ depends on $z$. A choice of nonzero vector $a_0 \in \mathfrak{A}_0$ determines a homomorphism $L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})_{\mathbb{R}} \to \mathfrak{A}_{\mathbb{R}}$ by $\lambda \mapsto \lambda(a_0)$. The image of $z$ under this homomorphism is a negative line $z \subset \mathfrak{A}_{\mathbb{R}}$, which does not depend on the choice of $a_0$. Of course $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathbb{R}}$ inherits a complex structure from its $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-action and the isomorphism $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{C}$, but this does *not* define the complex structure on $A_z(\mathbb{C})$. Instead, define an $\mathbb{R}$-linear endomorphism $I_z$ of $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathbb{R}}$ by

$$I_z(a) = \begin{cases} i \cdot a & \text{if } a \in z^{\perp} \\ -i \cdot a & \text{if } a \in z \end{cases}$$

and use this new complex structure $I_z$ to make $A_z(\mathbb{C})$ into a complex Lie group. The symplectic form $\psi$ on $\mathfrak{A}$ defined by (5.1.5) defines a polarization on $A_z(\mathbb{C})$, and the subspace

$$z^{\perp} \subset \mathfrak{A}_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \operatorname{Lie}(A_z)$$

satisfies Krämer's signature $(n-1, 1)$ condition. From the discussion above we find the complex uniformization

$$\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C}) \cong \bigsqcup_{(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})} \Gamma_{(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})} \backslash \mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})}. \tag{6.1.2}$$

*Remark* 6.1.2. The uniformization (6.1.2) shows that $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$ is almost the same as

$$\bigsqcup_{L \in \operatorname{gen}(\mathscr{L}(\infty))} \operatorname{Aut}(L) \backslash \mathcal{D}_L, \tag{6.1.3}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_L$ is the space of negative $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$-lines in $L_{\mathbb{R}}$. The difference is that each connected component of (6.1.3) appears in $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$ with multiplicity $h_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, by Remark 6.1.1, and the points in $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$ have $w_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ times as many automorphisms as the corresponding points of (6.1.3), by the exactness of (6.1.1).

*Remark* 6.1.3. If either $n>2$, or $n=2$ and $\mathscr{L}(\infty)$ is isotropic, then the strong approximation theorem implies that $\mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}(\infty))$ consists of $2^{1-o(d_{\boldsymbol{k}})}h_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ isometry classes of self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-lattices. Consequently, $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$ has $2^{1-o(d_{\boldsymbol{k}})}h_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2$ components.

Now we turn to the complex uniformization of the Kudla-Rapoport divisors. For any $m\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and any $\mathfrak{r}\mid\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, the algebraic stack of Definition 5.1.5 admits a complex uniformization

$$\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})(\mathbb{C})\cong\bigsqcup_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}\Big(\Gamma_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}\backslash\bigsqcup_{\substack{\lambda\in\mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})\\ \langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle=m}}\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}(\lambda)\Big),\tag{6.1.4}$$

in which $\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}(\lambda)\subset\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}$ is the space of negative lines orthogonal to $\lambda$. The essential point is that $\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}(\lambda)$ is precisely the locus of points $z\in\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}$ for which the $\mathbb{R}$-linear map $\lambda:\mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{R}}\to\mathfrak{A}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is $\mathbb{C}$-linear relative to the complex structure $I_z$.

Finally, we describe the complex uniformization of the CM cycle $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ of Section 5.2. Fix a triple $(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})$ in which

- $\mathfrak{A}_0$ and $\mathfrak{A}_1$ are self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules of signatures $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$, respectively, satisfying $L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1)\in\mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(\infty))$,
- $\mathfrak{B}$ is a self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module of signature $(n-1,0)$ satisfying $L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{B})\cong\Lambda$.

We attach to this triple the point $(A_0,A_1,B)\in\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})$, where

$$\begin{aligned}A_0(\mathbb{C})&=\mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{R}}/\mathfrak{A}_0\\ A_1(\mathbb{C})&=\mathfrak{A}_{1\mathbb{R}}/\mathfrak{A}_1\\ B(\mathbb{C})&=\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathfrak{B}\end{aligned}$$

as real Lie groups with $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-actions. The complex structure on $A_0(\mathbb{C})$ is given by the natural action of $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}\cong\mathbb{C}$ on $\mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{R}}$, and similarly for the complex structure on $B(\mathbb{C})$. The complex structure on $A_1(\mathbb{C})$, however, is given by the complex *conjugate* of the natural action of $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}\cong\mathbb{C}$ on $\mathfrak{A}_{1\mathbb{R}}$. Of course the elliptic curves $A_0$ and $A_1$ are endowed with their unique principal polarizations, while $B$ is endowed with the polarization determined by the symplectic form $\psi_B$ on $\mathfrak{B}\cong H_1(B(\mathbb{C}),\mathbb{Z})$ defined, as in (5.1.5), by

$$\psi_B(x,y)=\mathrm{tr}_{\boldsymbol{k}/\mathbb{Q}}\,h_{\mathfrak{B}}(\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}x,y).$$

The construction $(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})\mapsto(A_0,A_1,B)$ establishes a bijection from the set of isomorphism classes of all such triples to the set of isomorphism classes of the category $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})$, and defines an isomorphism of 0-dimensional complex orbifolds

$$\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})\cong\bigsqcup_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})}\Gamma_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})}\backslash\{y_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})}\},\tag{6.1.5}$$

where $y_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})}$ is a single point on which

$$\Gamma_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})}=\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})$$

acts trivially. The morphism $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})\to\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$ is easy to describe in terms of (6.1.5) and (6.1.2). For each triple $(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})$ we set $\mathfrak{A}=\mathfrak{A}_1\oplus\mathfrak{B}$, and send the point $y_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})}$ to the point of $\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}$ defined by the negative $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$-line $L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1)_{\mathbb{R}}\subset L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})_{\mathbb{R}}$.

*Remark* 6.1.4. The uniformization (6.1.5) implies that $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})$ has $2^{1-o(d_{\boldsymbol{k}})}h_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2$ points, each with $w_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2 \cdot |\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda)|$ automorphisms. Thus the rational number

$$\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} = \sum_{y\in \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})} \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Aut}(y)|}$$

is given by the explicit formula

$$\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} = \frac{h_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2}{w_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2} \cdot \frac{2^{1-o(d_{\boldsymbol{k}})}}{|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda)|}.$$

Moreover, we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.1.5.** *Assume that either $n > 2$, or $n = 2$ and $\mathscr{L}(\infty)$ is isotropic.*

1. *The rule $L_0 \mapsto L_0 \oplus \Lambda$ establishes a bijection*
$$\operatorname{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(\infty)) \to \operatorname{gen}(\mathscr{L}(\infty)).$$
2. *The set $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})$ has exactly one point in every connected component of $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$.*

*Proof.* (1) Since both sets have $2^{1-o(d_{\boldsymbol{k}})}h_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ elements, it suffices to show that the map is injective. For any hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules $L_0, L_0' \in \operatorname{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(\infty))$ there are fractional ideals $\mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathfrak{b}'$ such that $\mathfrak{b} \cong L_0$ and $\mathfrak{b}' \cong L_0'$, where the hermitian forms on $\mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathfrak{b}'$ are defined by $-x\overline{y}$. If $L_0 \oplus \Lambda \cong L_0' \oplus \Lambda$, then taking top exterior powers (in the category of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules) shows that $L_0 \cong L_0'$ as $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules. But this implies that $\mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathfrak{b}'$ lie in the same ideal class, and hence are isomorphic as hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules. Therefore $L_0 \cong L_0'$ as hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules. Claim (2) is an immediate consequence of (1). ☐

### 6.2. **Automorphic Green functions for Kudla-Rapoport divisors.**

For every $m \in \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ and every $\mathfrak{r} \mid \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, define a $\Delta$-invariant function $\varphi_{m,\mathfrak{r}} \in S_{\mathscr{L}}$ as the characteristic function of the subset

$$\{\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f : \ Q(\lambda) = m\} \subset \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f.$$

Using [Se73, Chapter IV.1.7], it is easy to check that $\varphi_{m,\mathfrak{r}} \neq 0$ if and only if $m \in \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r})^{-1}\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z}$. By Witt's theorem the finitely many nonzero $\varphi_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$'s form a basis of $S_{\mathscr{L}}^{\Delta}$. We call $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$ isotropic if $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_p/\mathscr{L}_p$ represents 0 non-trivially for every prime $p$ dividing $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. This condition is equivalent to the existence of an isotropic element of order $|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|$ in $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$.

**Lemma 6.2.1.** *For any $m \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and any $\mathfrak{r} \mid \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, there is an $f_{m,\mathfrak{r}} \in H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^{\Delta}$ with holomorphic part of the form*

$$f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}^{+}(\tau) = \varphi_{m,\mathfrak{r}} \cdot q^{-m} + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}} c_{m,\mathfrak{r}}^{+}(k) \cdot q^{k},$$

*for some $c_{m,\mathfrak{r}}^{+}(k) \in S_{\mathscr{L}}$. Furthermore*

1. *if $n > 2$, then $f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ is unique;*
2. *if $n = 2$ and $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$ is not isotropic, then $f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ is again unique;*
3. *if $n = 2$ and $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$ is isotropic, then any two such $f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ differ by a constant, and $f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ is uniquely determined if we impose the further condition that $c_{m,\mathfrak{r}}^{+}(0) \in S_{\mathscr{L}}$ vanishes at the trivial coset of $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$. That is to say, $c_{m,\mathfrak{r}}^{+}(0,0) = 0$.*

*Remark* 6.2.2. When $n = 2$ and $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$ is isotropic, we always choose $f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ so that $c_{m,\mathfrak{r}}^{+}(0,0) = 0$.

*Proof.* The existence statement follows from [BF, Proposition 3.11]. To prove the uniqueness statement when $n > 2$, we note that a harmonic Maass form $f \in H_k(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})$ with vanishing principal part is automatically holomorphic [BF, Proposition 3.5]. Since the weight is negative, it vanishes identically. Now suppose that $n = 2$. Using the same argument as for $n > 2$, we see that any two $f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ differ by an element of $M_0(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^\Delta$, that is, by an element of $S_{\mathscr{L}}$ which is invariant under the action of the group $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \Delta$.

If $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$ is not isotropic then it is easily seen that $M_0(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^\Delta = \{0\}$. If $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$ is isotropic then it follows from [Sch2, Theorem 5.4] that the space of invariants $M_0(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^\Delta$ has dimension 1. Moreover, the map from $M_0(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^\Delta$ to $\mathbb{C}$ given by evaluation at the trivial coset of $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$ defines an isomorphism. □

The proof of the following lemma is similar to the uniqueness part of Lemma 6.2.1, and is left to the reader.

**Lemma 6.2.3.** *Any $f \in H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^\Delta$ may be decomposed as a $\mathbb{C}$-linear combination*

$$f(\tau) = \mathrm{const} + \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \\ \mathfrak{r} \mid \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}} \alpha_{m,\mathfrak{r}} \cdot f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}(\tau)$$

*where* “const” *is a constant form in $M_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^\Delta$. This constant form is necessarily* 0*, except when $n = 2$ and $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$ is isotropic.*

For any $f$ as in Lemma 6.2.3, define a divisor on $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ with complex coefficients

$$\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) = \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \\ \mathfrak{r} \mid \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}} \alpha_{m,\mathfrak{r}} \cdot \mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m, \mathfrak{r}). \tag{6.2.1}$$

*Remark* 6.2.4. Although the decomposition of Lemma 6.2.3 is not unique, the divisor (6.2.1) does not depend on the choice of decomposition. This amounts to verifying that $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m, \mathfrak{r}) = 0$ whenever $f_{m,\mathfrak{r}} = 0$, which is clear: if $f_{m,\mathfrak{r}} = 0$ then $\varphi_{m,\mathfrak{r}} = 0$, which implies that $m \notin \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r})^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Thus $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m, \mathfrak{r}) = 0$ by Remark 5.1.6.

We now construct a Green function for $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$. It suffices to do this on each connected component $\Gamma_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}\backslash\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}$ of (6.1.2). The assumption that

$$L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}(\infty))$$

implies that $\widehat{L}(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \cong \mathscr{L}_f$ as hermitian $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules. Exactly as with $\mathscr{L}_f$, the $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})/L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})$ is equipped with a $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z}$-valued quadratic form whose automorphism group we again denote by $\Delta$, and there is an isomorphism of quadratic spaces

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})/L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \cong \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f, \tag{6.2.2}$$

which we now fix. This isomorphism identifies $S_{\mathscr{L}}$ with the space $S_{L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}$ of complex valued functions on the left hand side of (6.2.2). This identification depends on the choice of (6.2.2), but the restriction

$$S^\Delta_{L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})} \cong S^\Delta_{\mathscr{L}} \tag{6.2.3}$$

to $\Delta$-invariants is independent of the choice. Using the isomorphism (6.2.3), we view

$$f \in H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^\Delta$$

as a $\Delta$-invariant $S_{L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}$-valued harmonic Maass form. The construction (3.3.1) defines a function $\Phi_{L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}(f)$ on $\Gamma_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}\backslash\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}$ with logarithmic singularities along the divisor $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)(\mathbb{C})$. By repeating the above construction on every connected component of (6.1.2), we obtain a Green function $\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ for the divisor $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ on $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$. In particular, if we take $f = f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ as in Lemma 6.2.1, we obtain a Green function $\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}})$ for the divisor $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})$.

*Remark* 6.2.5. Throughout this section we are assuming that $\mathscr{L}$ is presented to us in the form $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{L}_0 \oplus \Lambda$, but this decomposition is needed only to define the CM cycle $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$. The construction of the divisor $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ on $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ and its Green function $\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ are valid for any incoherent self-dual hermitian $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L}$ of signature $(n,0)$.

In the remaining subsections we compute the value of $\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ at the points of $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})$.

6.3. **Coherent and incoherent Eisenstein series.** Let $P \subset \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ be the subgroup of upper triangular matrices. For each $\varphi \in S_{\mathscr{L}_0}$, define an *incoherent* Eisenstein series of weight 1

$$E_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,s,\varphi) = \sum_{\gamma \in P\backslash \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})} \omega_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\gamma)\varphi(0)\cdot(c\tau+d)^{-1}\cdot \mathrm{Im}(\gamma\tau)^{\frac{s}{2}}. \tag{6.3.1}$$

Here $\gamma = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d\end{smallmatrix}\right)$, $\tau = u+iv \in \mathbb{H}$, and $s$ is a complex variable with $\mathrm{Re}(s) \gg 0$. The Eisenstein series has meromorphic continuation to all $s$, and is holomorphic at $s=0$. As (6.3.1) is linear in $\varphi$, it may be viewed as a function $E_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,s)$ taking values in the dual space $S^\vee_{\mathscr{L}_0}$. This particular Eisenstein series was studied in [Scho] and [BY, Section 2]. Indeed, if we pick any $L_0 \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(\infty))$ then (6.3.1) is precisely the Eisenstein series denoted $E_{L_0}(\tau,s,1)$ in [BY], and depends only on the genus of $L_0$, not on $L_0$ itself.

By [BY, Proposition 2.5], the completed Eisenstein series

$$E^*_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,s,\varphi) = \Lambda(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}, s+1)\cdot E_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,s,\varphi)$$

satisfies the functional equation $E^*_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,-s,\varphi) = -E^*_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,s,\varphi)$, where

$$\Lambda(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},s) = |d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|^{\frac{s}{2}}\pi^{-\frac{s+1}{2}}\Gamma\big(\frac{s+1}{2}\big)L(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},s).$$

In particular $E_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,0)=0$. The central derivative $E'_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,0)$ at $s=0$ is a harmonic Maass form of weight 1 with representation $\omega^\vee_{\mathscr{L}_0}$, whose holomorphic part we denote by (as in [BY, (2.26)])

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau) = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}} a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m)\cdot q^m. \tag{6.3.2}$$

Up to a change of notation, the following proposition is due to Schofer [Scho]; see also [BY, Theorem 2.6]. Be warned that both references contain minor misstatements. The formula of part (4) is misstated in [Scho], but the error is corrected in [BY]. The formula of (2) is correct in [Scho], but is misstated in [BY].

**Proposition 6.3.1.** *Recall the finite set* $\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m)$ *of odd cardinality from (5.3.4), and the function* $\rho$ *of (1.5.1). The coefficients* $a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m) \in S^\vee_{\mathscr{L}_0}$ *are given by the following formulas.*

1. *If* $m<0$ *then* $a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m)=0$.
2. *The constant term is*

$$a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(0,\varphi) = \varphi(0)\cdot\left(\gamma + \log\left|\frac{4\pi}{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\right| - 2\frac{L'(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},0)}{L(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},0)}\right)$$

   *for every* $\varphi \in S_{\mathscr{L}_0}$.
3. *If* $m>0$ *and* $|\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m)|>1$, *then* $a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m)=0$.

(4) *If $m>0$ and $\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m)=\{p\}$ for a single prime $p$, then*

$$a^{+}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m,\varphi) = -\frac{w_{\boldsymbol{k}}}{2h_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\cdot\rho\left(\frac{m|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|}{p^{\epsilon}}\right)\cdot \mathrm{ord}_p(pm)\cdot\log(p)\sum_{\substack{\mu\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,f}/\mathscr{L}_{0,f}\\ Q(\mu)=m}} 2^{s(\mu)}\varphi(\mu).$$

*On the right hand side, $s(\mu)$ is the number of primes $q\mid d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ such that $\mu_q=0$, $\epsilon$ is defined by (5.3.6), and $Q(\mu)=m$ is understood as an equality in $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$.*

Define a *coherent* Eisenstein series of weight $-1$ associated to $\mathscr{L}_0(\infty)$ by

$$E_{\mathscr{L}_0(\infty)}(\tau,s,\varphi) = \sum_{\gamma\in P\backslash\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})}\omega_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\gamma)\varphi(0)\cdot(c\tau+d)\cdot\mathrm{Im}(\gamma\tau)^{\frac{s}{2}+1}. \tag{6.3.3}$$

This is the Eisenstein series denoted $E_{L_0}(\tau,s,-1)$ in [BY, Section 2], for any choice of $L_0\in\mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(\infty))$. The following relationship between the coherent and incoherent Eisenstein series was first observed by Kudla [Ku3, (2.17)], and is a special case of [BY, Lemma 2.3].

**Proposition 6.3.2.** *For any $\varphi\in S_{\mathscr{L}_0}$ the Eisenstein series (6.3.1) and (6.3.1) are related by the equality*

$$-2\cdot\bar{\partial}(E'_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,0,\varphi)d\tau) = E_{\mathscr{L}_0(\infty)}(\tau,0,\varphi)\cdot v^{-2}du\wedge dv$$

*of smooth 2-forms on $\mathbb{H}$.*

Suppose $L_0\in\mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(\infty))$. Exactly as in (6.2.3), there is an $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$-equivariant isomorphism $S_{L_0}^{\Delta_0}\cong S_{\mathscr{L}_0}^{\Delta_0}$, which allows us to define a non-holomorphic theta series $\theta_{L_0}:\mathbb{H}\to(S_{\mathscr{L}_0}^{\vee})^{\Delta_0}$ by

$$\theta_{L_0}(\tau,\varphi) = v\sum_{\lambda\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}L_0}\varphi(\lambda)e^{2\pi i\langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle\bar{\tau}}.$$

for any $\varphi\in S_{\mathscr{L}_0}^{\Delta_0}$. The following proposition follows from [BY, Proposition 2.2].

**Proposition 6.3.3** (Siegel-Weil formula). *The coherent Eisenstein series (6.3.3) is related to the above theta series by*

$$\frac{2^{o(d_{\boldsymbol{k}})}}{h_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\sum_{L_0\in\mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(\infty))}\theta_{L_0}(\tau) = E_{\mathscr{L}_0(\infty)}(\tau,0).$$

### 6.4. **CM values and the Rankin-Selberg $L$-function.**

For each $\varphi\in S_\Lambda$ define

$$R_\Lambda(m,\varphi) = \sum_{\substack{\lambda\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\Lambda\\ \langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle=m}}\varphi(\lambda).$$

These representation numbers are the Fourier coefficients of a holomorphic $S_\Lambda^{\vee}$-valued modular form

$$\theta_\Lambda(\tau,\varphi) = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Q}} R_\Lambda(m,\varphi)\cdot q^m \in M_{n-1}(\omega_\Lambda^{\vee}).$$

Given any $F\in S_n(\overline{\omega}_{\mathscr{L}})$ with Fourier expansion

$$F(\tau) = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}} b(m)\cdot q^m,$$

define the *Rankin-Selberg convolution $L$-function*

$$L(F,\theta_\Lambda,s) = \Gamma\big(\frac{s}{2}+n-1\big)\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}}\frac{\big\{\overline{b(m)},R_\Lambda(m)\big\}}{(4\pi m)^{\frac{s}{2}+n-1}}. \tag{6.4.1}$$

On the right hand side the pairing is the tautological pairing between $S_{\mathscr{L}}$ and its dual. The inclusion $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\Lambda/\Lambda \to \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$ determines a canonical surjection $S_{\mathscr{L}} \to S_\Lambda$, and hence an injection on dual spaces. In particular, this allows us to view $R_\Lambda(m)$ as an element of $S_{\mathscr{L}}^\vee$. The usual unfolding method shows that

$$L(F,\theta_\Lambda,s) = \int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}} \left\{\overline{F(\tau)}, E_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,s)\otimes\theta_\Lambda(\tau)\right\} v^{n-2}\,du\,dv, \tag{6.4.2}$$

where $\tau = u+iv$ and $E_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,s)$ is the incoherent Eisenstein series of (6.3.1). On the right hand side we are using the canonical isomorphism $S_{\mathscr{L}}^\vee \cong S_{\mathscr{L}_0}^\vee \otimes S_\Lambda^\vee$ to view $E_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,s)\otimes\theta_\Lambda(\tau)$ as an $S_{\mathscr{L}}^\vee$-valued function. Of course $L(F,\theta_\Lambda,0)=0$, as the Eisenstein series vanishes at $s=0$.

**Theorem 6.4.1.** *For every $f \in H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^\Delta$ the CM value*

$$\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)},f) = \sum_{y\in\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})} \frac{\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(y,f)}{|\operatorname{Aut}(y)|}$$

*satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{\deg_{\mathbb{C}}\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}}\cdot\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)},f) = -L'\big(\xi(f),\theta_\Lambda,0\big) + \mathrm{CT}\left[\{f^+,\mathcal{E}_{\mathscr{L}_0}\otimes\theta_\Lambda\}\right].$$

*Here the differential operator*

$$\xi : H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}}) \to S_n(\overline{\omega}_{\mathscr{L}})$$

*is defined by (2.2.3), and $\mathrm{CT}[\{f^+,\mathcal{E}_{\mathscr{L}_0}\otimes\theta_\Lambda\}]$ is the constant term of the q-expansion of $\{f^+,\mathcal{E}_{\mathscr{L}_0}\otimes\theta_\Lambda\}$.*

*Proof.* This is really a special case of [BY, Theorem 4.7], but beware that the statement of [*loc. cit.*] contains a sign error. We sketch the main ideas for the convenience of the reader. Recall from Section 6.1 that the complex points of $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ are indexed by triples $(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})$. If we fix such a point $y_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})} \in \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})$ and abbreviate $L_0 = L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1)$ and $L = \Lambda\oplus L_0$, then the theta function $\Theta_L(\tau,z)$ appearing in (3.3.1) admits a factorization

$$\Theta_L(\tau, y_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})}) = \theta_\Lambda(\tau)\otimes\theta_{L_0}(\tau)$$

at $z = y_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})}$. Hence

$$\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(y_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})},f) = \int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}}^{\mathrm{reg}} \{f,\theta_\Lambda\otimes\theta_{L_0}\}\,d\mu(\tau).$$

Summing over all points complex points of $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)},f) &= \sum_{\substack{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})\\ L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1)\in\mathscr{L}_0(\infty)\\ L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{B})\cong\Lambda}} \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Aut}(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{B})|}\int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}}^{\mathrm{reg}} \left\{f,\theta_\Lambda\otimes\theta_{L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1)}\right\}\,d\mu(\tau)\\
&= \frac{h_{\boldsymbol{k}}}{w_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda)|}\sum_{L_0\in\mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(\infty))}\int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}}^{\mathrm{reg}} \{f,\theta_\Lambda\otimes\theta_{L_0}\}\,d\mu(\tau)\\
&= \frac{\deg_{\mathbb{C}}\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}}{2}\int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}}^{\mathrm{reg}} \{f(\tau),\theta_\Lambda(\tau)\otimes E_{\mathscr{L}_0(\infty)}(\tau,0)\}\,d\mu(\tau)
\end{aligned}$$

by the Siegel-Weil formula (Proposition 6.3.3) and Remark 6.1.4. Applying Proposition 6.3.2 and Stokes' theorem, a simple calculation, as in the proof of [BY, Theorem 4.7], shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}} \cdot \Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}, f) \\
&\quad = -\int^{\mathrm{reg}}_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}} \{f, \theta_\Lambda \otimes \bar\partial E'_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,0)\, d\tau\} \\
&\quad = -\int^{\mathrm{reg}}_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}} d\{f, \theta_\Lambda \otimes E'_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,0)\, d\tau\} - \int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}} \{\overline{\xi(f)}, \theta_\Lambda \otimes E'_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau,0)\} v^n \, d\mu(\tau) \\
&\quad = \mathrm{CT}[\{f^+(\tau), \theta_\Lambda(\tau)\mathcal{E}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(\tau)\}] - L'(\xi(f), \theta_\Lambda, 0),
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed. □

*Remark* 6.4.2. Let $\varphi_{\mathfrak{r}} \in S_{\mathscr{L}}$ be the characteristic function of

$$\mathfrak{r}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f \subset \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f.$$

By abuse of notation we denote again by $\varphi_{\mathfrak{r}}$ the similarly defined elements of $S_{\mathscr{L}_0}$ and $S_\Lambda$. If $A$ is an element of $S_{\mathscr{L}}^\vee$, $S_{\mathscr{L}_0}^\vee$, or $S_\Lambda^\vee$ abbreviate $A(\mathfrak{r}) = A(\varphi_{\mathfrak{r}})$. For example

$$R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r}) = R_\Lambda(m,\varphi_{\mathfrak{r}}) = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}\Lambda \\ \langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle = m}} 1.$$

The following is a restatement of Theorem 6.4.1 in the case $f = f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$.

**Corollary 6.4.3.** *The harmonic form $f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ of Lemma 6.2.1 satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}} \cdot \Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}, f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) &= -L'(\xi(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}), \theta_\Lambda, 0) + c^+_{m,\mathfrak{r}}(0,0) \cdot a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(0,\mathfrak{r}) \cdot R_\Lambda(0,\mathfrak{r}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2 \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \\ m_1+m_2=m}} a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1,\mathfrak{r}) \cdot R_\Lambda(m_2,\mathfrak{r}).
\end{aligned}$$

## 7. METRIZED LINE BUNDLES AND DERIVATIVES OF $L$-FUNCTIONS

Throughout Section 7 we fix, as in Section 6, a pair $(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)$ consisting of

- an incoherent self-dual $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L}_0$ of signature $(1,0)$,
- a self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module $\Lambda$ of signature $(n-1,0)$.

As in Remark 5.2.3, define an incoherent self-dual $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{L}_0 \oplus \Lambda$ of signature $(n,0)$.

In this section we state and prove a preliminary form of our main result. This preliminary form, Theorem 7.3.1 below, is an intersection formula for the Kudla-Rapoport divisors (endowed with the automorphic Green functions constructed eariler) with the CM cycle $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$. The intersection takes place on the open Shimura variety $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$, and is expressed in the language of metrized line bundles. In Section 8 the result will be reformulated in terms of arithmetic Chow groups on the canonical toroidal compactification of $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$.

7.1. **Generalities on metrized line bundles.** In this subsection, $\mathtt{M}$ is any equidimensional regular algebraic stack, flat and of finite type over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. A *metrized line bundle* $\widehat{\mathtt{L}} = (\mathtt{L}, ||\cdot||)$ on $\mathtt{M}$ consists of a line bundle $\mathtt{L}$ and a hermitian metric $||\cdot||$ on the complex points $\mathtt{L}(\mathbb{C})$. The isomorphism classes of metrized line bundles form a group $\widehat{\mathrm{Pic}}(\mathtt{M})$ under tensor product. An *arithmetic divisor* $\widehat{\mathtt{D}} = (\mathtt{D}, \Phi)$ is a pair consisting of a divisor $\mathtt{D}$ on $\mathtt{M}$ and a Green function[6] on $\mathtt{M}(\mathbb{C})$ for the complex fiber $\mathtt{D}(\mathbb{C})$. The arithmetic divisors form a group $\widehat{\mathrm{Div}}(\mathtt{M})$ under addition. If we start with an arithmetic divisor $\widehat{\mathtt{D}}$, the constant function 1 on $\mathtt{M}$ defines a rational section $\boldsymbol{s}$ of the line bundle $\mathtt{L} = \mathcal{O}(\mathtt{D})$ associated to $\mathtt{D}$, and there is a unique metric $||\cdot||$ on $\mathtt{L}$ satisfying $-\log ||\boldsymbol{s}||_z^2 = \Phi(z)$. This establishes a surjection

$$\widehat{\mathrm{Div}}(\mathtt{Y}) \to \widehat{\mathrm{Pic}}(\mathtt{Y}).$$

Suppose that $\mathtt{Y}$ is smooth over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ of relative dimension 0, and comes equipped with a finite and unramified morphism $i : \mathtt{Y} \to \mathtt{M}$. As in [KRY2, Chapter 2.1] there is a linear functional

$$\widehat{\deg} : \widehat{\mathrm{Pic}}(\mathtt{Y}) \to \mathbb{R}$$

defined by

$$\widehat{\deg}\, \widehat{\mathtt{L}} = \sum_{\mathtt{D}_i} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \sum_{y \in \mathtt{D}_i(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})} \frac{m_i \log(\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{p}))}{|\operatorname{Aut}(y)|} - \sum_{y \in \mathtt{Y}(\mathbb{C})} \frac{\log ||\sigma||_y^2}{|\operatorname{Aut}(y)|}$$

for any rational section $\sigma$ of $\mathtt{L}$ with divisor $\mathrm{div}(\sigma) = \sum_i m_i \mathtt{D}_i$. The composition

$$\widehat{\mathrm{Pic}}(\mathtt{M}) \xrightarrow{i^*} \widehat{\mathrm{Pic}}(\mathtt{Y}) \xrightarrow{\widehat{\deg}} \mathbb{R},$$

called *arithmetic intersection against* $\mathtt{Y}$, is denoted

$$[\,\cdot : \mathtt{Y}] : \widehat{\mathrm{Pic}}(\mathtt{M}) \to \mathbb{R}.$$

Keeping $i : \mathtt{Y} \to \mathtt{M}$ as above, suppose that we are given a Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathtt{Z} \cap \mathtt{Y} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathtt{Y} \arrow[d, "i"] \\
\mathtt{Z} \arrow[r, "j"'] & \mathtt{M}
\end{tikzcd}$$

in which $\mathtt{Z}$ is Cohen-Macaulay of dimension $\dim(\mathtt{M}) - 1$, and the morphism $j$ is finite, unramified, and representable. In the notation of [Vi, Section 3], $\mathtt{Z}$ determines a divisor $j_*[\mathtt{Z}]$ on $\mathtt{M}$. This can be made more explicit as follows. The hypotheses on $j$ imply, as in [Vi, Lemma 1.19] that any geometric point of $\mathtt{M}$ admits an étale neighborhood $U \to \mathtt{M}$ with the property that $\mathtt{Z}_{/U} \to U$ restricts to a closed immersion of schemes on each connected component of $\mathtt{Z}_{/U}$. In particular each connected component of $\mathtt{Z}_{/U}$ defines a divisor on $U$, and $(j_*[\mathtt{Z}])_{/U}$ is their sum. When no confusion is possible we use the same letter $\mathtt{Z}$ to denote the stack, the associated divisor, and the associated line bundle.

Suppose $\Phi$ is a Green function for $\mathtt{Z}$, and set $\widehat{\mathtt{Z}} = (\mathtt{Z}, \Phi)$. Assuming that $\mathtt{Z} \cap \mathtt{Y}$ has dimension 0, we have the explicit formula $[\widehat{\mathtt{Z}} : \mathtt{Y}] = I(\mathtt{Z} : \mathtt{Y}) + \Phi(\mathtt{Y})$ where the first term is the *finite intersection multiplicity*[7]

---

[6] Throughout Section 7, all divisors have integer coefficients, and all Green functions are real-valued.

$$I(\mathtt{Z}:\mathtt{Y})=\sum_{\mathfrak{p}\subset\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\log(\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{p}))\sum_{y\in(\mathtt{Z}\cap\mathtt{Y})(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})}\frac{\mathrm{length}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathtt{Z}\cap\mathtt{Y},y}}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathtt{Z}\cap\mathtt{Y},y})}{|\operatorname{Aut}(y)|},$$

and the second term is

$$\Phi(\mathtt{Y})=\sum_{y\in\mathtt{Y}(\mathbb{C})}\frac{\Phi(y)}{|\operatorname{Aut}(y)|}.$$

7.2. **The cotautological bundle and the Chowla-Selberg formula.** Let $S$ be a scheme and $\pi:A\to S$ an abelian scheme. As in [Lan, Section 2.1.6], define a coherent $\mathcal{O}_S$-module, the *algebraic de Rham cohomology* of $A$, as the hypercohomology $H^i_{dR}(A)=\mathbb{R}^i\pi_*(\Omega^\bullet_{A/S})$ of the de Rham complex

$$0\to\mathcal{O}_A\to\Omega^1_{A/S}\to\Omega^2_{A/S}\to\cdots.$$

The *algebraic de Rham homology* $H_1^{dR}(A)=\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_S}(H^1_{dR}(A),\mathcal{O}_S)$ sits in an exact sequence

$$0\to\operatorname{Fil}^1(A)\to H_1^{dR}(A)\to\operatorname{Lie}(A)\to 0,$$

and $\operatorname{Fil}^1(A)$ is canonically isomorphic to the $\mathcal{O}_S$-dual of $\operatorname{Lie}(A^\vee)$.

**Definition 7.2.1.** Let $(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}},A^{\mathrm{univ}})$ denote the universal object over $\mathtt{M}$, and recall that $A^{\mathrm{univ}}$ is endowed with an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-stable $\mathcal{O}_{\mathtt{M}}$-submodule $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{univ}}\subset\operatorname{Lie}(A^{\mathrm{univ}})$ such that the quotient $\operatorname{Lie}(A^{\mathrm{univ}})/\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{univ}}$ is locally free of rank one. The *cotautological bundle* on $\mathtt{M}$ is the line bundle

$$\mathtt{T}=\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathtt{M}}}(\operatorname{Fil}^1(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}),\operatorname{Lie}(A^{\mathrm{univ}})/\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{univ}}).$$

Denote by $\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}$ the restriction of $\mathtt{T}$ to $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$.

Recall from Section 6.1 that each connected component of $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$ admits a uniformization $\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}\to\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$, where $\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}$ is the space of negative $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$-lines in $L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})$. The hermitian symmetric domain $\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}$ carries a tautological bundle $\mathcal{L}$, whose fiber at a point $z$ is the line $z$, made into a complex vector space using the fixed isomorphism $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}\cong\mathbb{C}$. The following proposition and remark explain the connection between $\mathcal{L}$ and the cotautological bundle.

**Proposition 7.2.2.** *At any point $z\in\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}$ there is a canonical $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$-linear isomorphism*

$$f_z:\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L},z}\to z$$

*from the fiber at $z$ of (the pullback of) $\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}$ to negative line $z$.*

*Proof.* Identify $\boldsymbol{k}\otimes_{\mathbb{Q}}\mathbb{C}\cong\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}$ in such a way that $x\otimes 1\mapsto(x,\overline{x})$, and define idempotents $e=(1,0)$ and $\overline{e}=(0,1)$. If $X$ is any complex vector space with a commuting action of $\boldsymbol{k}$, then $\boldsymbol{k}$ acts on $eX$ through the fixed embedding $\boldsymbol{k}\to\mathbb{C}$, and acts on $\overline{e}X$ through the conjugate embedding.

Let $(A_0,A_z)\in\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$ be the image of $z$ under $\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}\to\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$. The map

$$\mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{C}}\cong H_1^{dR}(A_0)\xrightarrow{\overline{e}}\overline{e}H_1^{dR}(A_0)\cong\operatorname{Fil}^1(A_0)$$

restricts to a $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$-linear isomorphism $\mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{R}}\cong\operatorname{Fil}^1(A_0)$, while the quotient map

$$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathbb{C}}\cong H_1^{dR}(A_z)\to\operatorname{Lie}(A_z)$$

---

[7] As both $\mathtt{Z}$ and $\mathtt{Y}$ are Cohen-Macaulay, the finite intersection multiplicity agrees with the more natural *Serre intersection multiplicity* defined as in [SABK, p. 11] or [Ho3, Section 3.1]. This follows from [Se00, p. 111].

restricts to a $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$-linear isomorphism $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathrm{Lie}(A_z)$. Thus we obtain isomorphisms

$$L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}}(\mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{R}}, \mathfrak{A}_{\mathbb{R}}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}}(\mathrm{Fil}^1(A_0), \mathrm{Lie}(A)_z),$$

and tracing through the constructions of Section 6.1 shows that their composition identifies $z^{\perp}$ with $\mathrm{Hom}_{\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}}(\mathrm{Fil}^1(A_0), \mathcal{F}_z)$. The surjection

$$L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})_{\mathbb{R}} \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}}(\mathrm{Fil}^1(A_0), \mathrm{Lie}(A_z)/\mathcal{F}_z)$$

therefore has kernel $z^{\perp}$, and identifies $z \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}}(\mathrm{Fil}^1(A_0), \mathrm{Lie}(A_z)/\mathcal{F}_z)$ as desired. □

*Remark* 7.2.3. Proposition 7.2.2 does *not* say that the pullback of $\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}$ to $\mathcal{D}_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}$ is isomorphic to the tautological bundle $\mathcal{L}$. The point is that the signature conditions imposed on $\mathrm{Lie}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}})$ and $\mathrm{Lie}(A^{\mathrm{univ}})/\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{univ}}$ imply that the action of $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$ on the fiber at $z$ of $\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}$ is through the complex conjugate of the fixed isomorphism $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{C}$. Thus the isomorphism $f_z$ of Proposition 7.2.2 is complex-conjugate-linear. It is more natural to consider the complex-linear isomorphism

$$f_z^{\vee} : \mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L},z} \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(z, \mathbb{C})$$

defined by $f_z^{\vee}(s) = \langle \cdot, f_z(s) \rangle$, which identifies the pullback of $\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}$ with the *dual* of the tautological bundle.

We use Proposition 7.2.2 to metrize the cotautological bundle $\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}$: the norm of a section $s$ is defined to be

$$||s||_z^2 = -4\pi e^{\gamma} \cdot \langle f_z(s), f_z(s) \rangle, \tag{7.2.1}$$

where $\gamma = -\Gamma'(1)$ is Euler's constant. The cotautological bundle endowed with the above metric is denoted

$$\widehat{\mathtt{T}}_{\mathscr{L}} \in \widehat{\mathrm{Pic}}(\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}).$$

The remainder of this subsection is devoted to studying the image of $\widehat{\mathtt{T}}_{\mathscr{L}}$ under the arithmetic intersection

$$[\,\cdot : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] : \widehat{\mathrm{Pic}}(\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}) \to \mathbb{R}$$

of Section 7.1. In particular, we will explain how the Chowla-Selberg formula implies the following theorem.

**Theorem 7.2.4.** *For any $\varphi \in S_{\mathscr{L}_0}$, the metrized cotautological bundle satisfies*

$$\varphi(0) \cdot [\widehat{\mathtt{T}}_{\mathscr{L}} : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] = -\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \cdot a^{+}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(0, \varphi),$$

*where $a^{+}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(0) \in S^{\vee}_{\mathscr{L}_0}$ is defined by (6.3.2), and $\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ is defined in Remark 6.1.4.*

*In particular, taking $\varphi$ to be the characteristic function of $\mathfrak{r}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,f}/\mathscr{L}_{0,f}$, as in Remark 6.4.2, shows that*

$$[\widehat{\mathtt{T}}_{\mathscr{L}}^{\otimes R_{\Lambda}(m,\mathfrak{r})} : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] = -\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \cdot a^{+}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(0, \mathfrak{r}) \cdot R_{\Lambda}(m, \mathfrak{r})$$

*for all $m \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathfrak{r} \mid \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$.*

The proof requires some preparation. First we state the Chowla-Selberg formula in a form suited to our purposes. Suppose $E$ is an elliptic curve over $\mathbb{C}$ with complex multiplication by $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. Fix a model of $E$ over a finite extension $K/\mathbb{Q}$ contained in $\mathbb{C}$ and large enough that $E$ has everywhere good reduction, and let $\pi : \mathcal{E} \to \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)$ be the Néron model of $E$ over $\mathcal{O}_K$. Let $\omega$ be a nonzero rational section of the line bundle $\pi_*\Omega^1_{\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{O}_K}$ on $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)$ with divisor

$$\mathrm{div}(\omega) = \sum_{\mathfrak{q}} m(\mathfrak{q}) \cdot \mathfrak{q},$$

where the sum is over the closed points $\mathfrak{q} \in \operatorname{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)$. The *Faltings height* of $E$ is defined as

$$h_{\mathrm{Falt}}(E) = \frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}\left(\sum_{\mathfrak{q}} \log(\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{q}))\cdot m(\mathfrak{q}) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\tau: K\to\mathbb{C}} \log\left|\int_{\mathcal{E}^\tau(\mathbb{C})} \omega^\tau \wedge \overline{\omega^\tau}\right|\right).$$

It is independent of the choice of $K$, the model of $E$ over $K$, and the section $\omega$. The Chowla-Selberg formula [Co] implies that

$$-2h_{\mathrm{Falt}}(E) = \log(2\pi) + \frac{1}{2}\log|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}| + \frac{L'(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},0)}{L(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},0)}. \tag{7.2.2}$$

Recall that $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ carries over it a universal triple of abelian schemes $(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}, A_1^{\mathrm{univ}}, B^{\mathrm{univ}})$. Define a line bundle

$$\mathrm{coLie}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}) = \pi_*\Omega^1_{A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}/\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}}$$

on $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$, where $\pi : A_0^{\mathrm{univ}} \to \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ is the structure morphism. A vector $\omega \in \mathrm{coLie}(A_{0,y}^{\mathrm{univ}})$ in the fiber at a complex point $y \in \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})$ is a global holomorphic 1-form on $A_{0,y}^{\mathrm{univ}}(\mathbb{C})$, and we denote by

$$\widehat{\mathrm{coLie}}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}) \in \widehat{\mathrm{Pic}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)})$$

the line bundle $\mathrm{coLie}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}})$ endowed with the metric

$$||\omega||_y^2 = \left|\int_{A_{0,y}^{\mathrm{univ}}(\mathbb{C})} \omega\wedge\overline{\omega}\right|. \tag{7.2.3}$$

With this definition,

$$\widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\mathrm{coLie}}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}) = \sum_{(A_0,A_1,B)\in\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})} \frac{2h_{\mathrm{Falt}}(A_0)}{|\operatorname{Aut}(A_0,A_1,B)|}. \tag{7.2.4}$$

Of course $\mathrm{Lie}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}})$ is isomorphic to the dual of $\mathrm{coLie}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}})$. Denote by

$$\widehat{\mathrm{Lie}}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}) \in \widehat{\mathrm{Pic}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}) \tag{7.2.5}$$

the line bundle $\mathrm{Lie}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}})$ with the metric dual to (7.2.3). More explicitly, if we endow $\mathfrak{A}_0 = H_1(A_{0,y}^{\mathrm{univ}}(\mathbb{C}),\mathbb{Z})$ with its hermitian form $h_{\mathfrak{A}_0}$ as in Section 5.1, then $\mathrm{Lie}(A_{0,y}^{\mathrm{univ}}) \cong \mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{R}}$ as real vector spaces, and $||v||_y^2 = |d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_{\mathfrak{A}_0}(v,v)$ for any $v \in \mathrm{Lie}(A_{0,y}^{\mathrm{univ}})$.

**Lemma 7.2.5.** *The metrized line bundle* $\widehat{\mathrm{Lie}}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}})$ *satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{\deg_{\mathbb{C}}\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}}\cdot\widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\mathrm{Lie}}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}) = \log(2\pi) + \frac{1}{2}\log|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}| + \frac{L'(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},0)}{L(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},0)}.$$

*Of course we may define* $\widehat{\mathrm{Lie}}(A_1^{\mathrm{univ}})$ *in the same manner as (7.2.5), and the stated equality holds with* $A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}$ *replaced by* $A_1^{\mathrm{univ}}$.

*Proof.* Combine (7.2.4) and the Chowla-Selberg formula (7.2.2). □

For any positive $c \in \mathbb{R}$, define the *twisted trivial bundle*

$$\widehat{\mathbf{1}}(c) \in \widehat{\mathrm{Pic}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)})$$

as the structure sheaf $\mathcal{O}_{\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}}$ endowed with the metric $||f||_y^2 = c\cdot|f(y)|^2$. It is clear from the definitions that

$$\widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\mathbf{1}}(c) = -\log(c)\cdot\deg_{\mathbb{C}}\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}. \tag{7.2.6}$$

**Lemma 7.2.6.** *There is an isomorphism*

$$\widehat{\mathtt{T}}_{\mathscr{L}}|_{\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}} \cong \widehat{\mathrm{Lie}}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}) \otimes \widehat{\mathrm{Lie}}(A_1^{\mathrm{univ}}) \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}}\left(16\pi^3 e^{\gamma}\right)$$

*of metrized line bundles on* $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$.

*Proof.* Recall that $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ carries a universal pair of abelian schemes $(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}, A^{\mathrm{univ}})$, and that $A^{\mathrm{univ}}$ comes with a universal $\mathcal{O}_{\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}}$-submodule $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{univ}} \subset \mathrm{Lie}(A^{\mathrm{univ}})$. By definition of the morphism $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \to \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$, the universal objects over $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ and $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ are related[8] by

$$(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}, A^{\mathrm{univ}})_{/\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}} \cong (A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}, A_1^{\mathrm{univ}} \times B^{\mathrm{univ}}),$$

and the isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Lie}(A^{\mathrm{univ}})|_{\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}} \cong \mathrm{Lie}(A_1^{\mathrm{univ}} \times B^{\mathrm{univ}})$$

identifies $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{univ}}|_{\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}} \cong \mathrm{Lie}(B^{\mathrm{univ}})$. In particular there is a canonical isomorphism

$$\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}|_{\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}} \cong \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{Fil}^1(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}), \mathrm{Lie}(A_1^{\mathrm{univ}})).$$

For any elliptic curve $A_0 \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ over a ring, the short exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathrm{Fil}^1(A_0) \to H_1^{dR}(A_0) \to \mathrm{Lie}(A_0) \to 0$$

of $R$-modules is dual to

$$0 \to H^0(A_0, \Omega^1_{A_0/R}) \to H^1_{dR}(A_0) \to H^1(A_0, \mathcal{O}_{A_0}) \to 0,$$

and there is a canonical identification $H^1(A_0, \mathcal{O}_{A_0}) \cong \mathrm{Lie}(A_0^\vee)$. In particular there is canonical perfect pairing $\mathrm{Lie}(A_0^\vee) \otimes_R \mathrm{Fil}^1(A_0) \to \mathcal{O}_S$, and identifying $\mathrm{Lie}(A_0) \cong \mathrm{Lie}(A_0^\vee)$ via the unique principal polarization, we obtain a perfect pairing

$$\mathrm{Lie}(A_0) \otimes_R \mathrm{Fil}^1(A_0) \to R. \tag{7.2.7}$$

Applying this with $A_0 = A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}$ yields the second isomorphism in

$$\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}|_{\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}} \cong \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{Fil}^1(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}), \mathrm{Lie}(A_1^{\mathrm{univ}})) \cong \mathrm{Lie}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}) \otimes \mathrm{Lie}(A_1^{\mathrm{univ}}).$$

All that remains is to keep track of the metrics under this isomorphism. This is routine, once one knows an explicit formula for the pairing (7.2.7) when $A_0 \in \mathtt{M}_{(1,0)}(\mathbb{C})$ is the complex elliptic curve with homology $\mathfrak{A}_0 = H_1(A_0(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z})$, as in the discussion surrounding (5.1.4). Taking $e$ and $\overline{e}$ as in the proof of Proposition 7.2.2, the compositions

$$\mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{R}} \to \mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{C}} \cong H_1^{dR}(A_0) \xrightarrow{e} eH_1^{dR}(A_0) \cong \mathrm{Lie}(A_0)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{R}} \to \mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{C}} \cong H_1^{dR}(A_0) \xrightarrow{\overline{e}} \overline{e}H_1^{dR}(A_0) \cong \mathrm{Fil}^1(A_0)$$

are $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$-linear isomorphisms. Thus the pairing (7.2.7) corresponds to a pairing

$$\mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{R}} \times \mathfrak{A}_{0\mathbb{R}} \to \mathbb{C},$$

which is hermitian with respect to the action of $\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{C}$. Using the proof of [Ho1, Proposition 4.4], one can show that this pairing is $2\pi|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|^{-1/2} \cdot h_{\mathfrak{A}_0}$. The rest of the proof is elementary linear algebra, and is left to the reader. □

---

[8] There is a mild abuse of notation: we are using $A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}$ to denote both the universal elliptic curve over $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$, and the universal elliptic curve over $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$.

*Proof of Theorem 7.2.4.* Combining Lemmas 7.2.5 and 7.2.6 with (7.2.6) shows that

$$\begin{aligned}[\widehat{\mathtt{T}}_{\mathscr{L}} : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] &= \widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\mathrm{Lie}}(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}) + \widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\mathrm{Lie}}(A_1^{\mathrm{univ}}) + \widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\mathbf{1}}\left(16\pi^3 e^{\gamma}\right) \\ &= \deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \left( 2\frac{L'(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},0)}{L(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},0)} + \log\left|\frac{d_{\boldsymbol{k}}}{4\pi}\right| - \gamma \right),\end{aligned}$$

and comparing with Proposition 6.3.1 completes the proof. □

7.3. **The main result, preliminary form.** Let $f \in H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})$ be a $\Delta$-invariant harmonic Maass form. The divisor $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ on $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ of (6.2.1), with its Green function $\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ of Section 6.2, determines an arithmetic divisor

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) \in \widehat{\mathrm{Div}}(\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}), \tag{7.3.1}$$

and we denote in the same way the corresponding metrized line bundle. Throughout the rest of Section 7 we fix $m \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and $\mathfrak{r} \mid \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and take $f = f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ to be the harmonic form of Lemma 6.2.1, with holomorphic part

$$f^{+}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}(\tau) = \varphi_{m,\mathfrak{r}} q^{-m} + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}} c^{+}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}(k) \cdot q^{k}.$$

The underlying divisor of (7.3.1) is then simply the Kudla-Rapoport divisor $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})$.

**Theorem 7.3.1.** *Keeping the notation of Section 6.4, the harmonic form $f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ satisfies*

$$[\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] + c^{+}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}(0,0) \cdot [\widehat{\mathtt{T}}_{\mathscr{L}} : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] = -\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \cdot L'\big(\xi(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}), \theta_{\Lambda}, 0\big).$$

The proof of the theorem will occupy the rest of Section 7, although we have enough information to prove a special case right now. Fix $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$. In Section 5.3 we defined an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-stack $\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r})$ equipped with a finite, unramified, and representable morphism

$$\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r}) \to \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}.$$

If $m_1 > 0$, then $\mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r})$ has dimension zero, and defines a divisor on $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$, necessarily supported in nonzero characteristic. By endowing this divisor with the trivial Green function, we obtain an arithmetic divisor

$$\widehat{\mathtt{X}}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r}) \in \widehat{\mathrm{Div}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}). \tag{7.3.2}$$

**Proposition 7.3.2.** *Suppose $m = m_1 + m_2$ with $m_1 \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and $m_2 \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$. The arithmetic divisor (7.3.2) satisfies*

$$\widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\mathtt{X}}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r}) = -\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \cdot a^{+}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1,\mathfrak{r}) \cdot R_{\Lambda}(m_2,\mathfrak{r}).$$

*Proof.* This follows by comparing Theorem 5.3.2 with Proposition 6.3.1. Abbreviate

$$\mathtt{X} = \mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r}).$$

If $|\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1)| > 1$ then both sides of the desired equality are 0, so assume $\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1) = \{p\}$ for a prime $p$, necessarily nonsplit in $\boldsymbol{k}$, and let $\mathfrak{p}$ be the prime of $\boldsymbol{k}$ above $p$. Theorem 5.3.2 implies

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\mathtt{X}}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r}) &= \log(\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{p})) \sum_{x \in \mathtt{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathrm{alg}})} \frac{\mathrm{length}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathtt{X},x})}{|\operatorname{Aut}(x)|} \\ &= \frac{h_{\boldsymbol{k}} \log(p)}{w_{\boldsymbol{k}} |\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda)|} \cdot \mathrm{ord}_p(pm_1) \cdot R_{\Lambda}(m_2,\mathfrak{r}) \cdot \rho\left(\frac{m_1 \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{s})}{p^{\epsilon}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{s}$ is the prime-to-$\mathfrak{p}$ part of $\mathfrak{r}$, and $\epsilon$ is defined by (5.3.6). On the other hand, Proposition 6.3.1 tells us that

$$a^{+}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1,\mathfrak{r}) = -\frac{w_{\boldsymbol{k}}\log(p)}{2h_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\cdot \mathrm{ord}_p(pm_1)\cdot\rho\left(\frac{m_1|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|}{p^{\epsilon}}\right)\sum_{\substack{\mu\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,f}/\mathscr{L}_{0,f}\\ Q(\mu)=m_1}} 2^{s(\mu)}\varphi_{\mathfrak{r}}(\mu),$$

where $\varphi_{\mathfrak{r}}$ is the characteristic function of $\mathfrak{r}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,f}/\mathscr{L}_{0,f}\subset\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,f}/\mathscr{L}_{0,f}$.

The proposition follows from the above equalities and Remark 6.1.4, once we prove

$$\rho\left(\frac{m_1|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|}{p^{\epsilon}}\right)\sum_{\substack{\mu\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,f}/\mathscr{L}_{0,f}\\ Q(\mu)=m_1}} 2^{s(\mu)}\varphi_{\mathfrak{r}}(\mu) = 2^{o(d_{\boldsymbol{k}})}\rho\left(\frac{m_1\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{s})}{p^{\epsilon}}\right).$$

Both sides factor as a product of local terms, and the equality of local terms for primes not dividing $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is obvious. It therefore suffices to prove, for every prime $\ell\mid d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, the relation

$$\rho_\ell(m_1|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|)\sum_{\substack{\mu\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}/\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}\\ Q(\mu)=m_1}} 2^{s_\ell(\mu)}\varphi_{\mathfrak{r},\ell}(\mu) = 2\rho_\ell(m_1\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{s})), \tag{7.3.3}$$

where $\rho_\ell(k)$ is the number of ideals in $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},\ell}$ of norm $k\mathbb{Z}_\ell$,

$$s_\ell(\mu)=\begin{cases}1 & \text{if } \mu=0\\ 0 & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$

and $\varphi_{\mathfrak{r},\ell}$ is the characteristic function of $\mathfrak{r}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}/\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}\subset\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}/\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}$.

Case 1: If $\mathrm{ord}_\ell(m_1)\geq 0$, then only the term $\mu=0$ contributes to the left hand side of (7.3.3), both sides of the equality are equal to 2, and we are done.

Case 2: If $\mathrm{ord}_\ell(m_1)<-1$, then $\rho_\ell(m_1|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|)=\rho_\ell(m_1\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{s}))=0$, and we are done.

Case 3: If $\mathrm{ord}_\ell(m_1)=-1$ and $\ell\nmid\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r})$, then $\rho_\ell(m_1\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{s}))=0$. On the left hand side of (7.3.3), the assumption $\mathrm{ord}_\ell(m_1)=-1$ implies that any $\mu$ appearing in the sum must be nonzero, and hence $\varphi_{\mathfrak{r},\ell}(\mu)=0$. Thus in this case both sides of (7.3.3) vanish.

Case 4: If $\mathrm{ord}_\ell(m_1)=-1$ and $\ell\mid\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{s})$, then $\rho_\ell(m_1|d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|)=\rho_\ell(m_1\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{s}))=1$. On the other hand, as $\ell\notin\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1)$, the rank one $\boldsymbol{k}_p$-hermitian space $\mathscr{V}_{0,\ell}$ represents $m_1$. It follows from the self-duality of $\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}$ that $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}$ represents $m_1$, and from this it is easy to see that the rank one $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}/\mathfrak{p}$-quadratic space $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}/\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}$ has two distinct nonzero solutions to $Q(\mu)=m_1$. Thus

$$\sum_{\substack{\mu\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}/\mathscr{L}_{0,\ell}\\ Q(\mu)=m_1}} 2^{s_\ell(\mu)}=2$$

and again (7.3.3) holds.

Case 5: If $\mathrm{ord}_\ell(m_1)=-1$ and $\ell=p$, then $\rho_\ell(m_1\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{s}))=0$. On the left hand side of (7.3.3), the sum over $\mu$ is empty: any $\mu\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,p}/\mathscr{L}_{0,p}$ representing $m_1\in\mathbb{Q}_p/\mathbb{Z}_p$ could be lifted to $\mu\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{0,p}$ representing $m_1\in\mathbb{Q}_p$, contradicting $p\in\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1)$. Thus both sides of (7.3.3) vanish.

This exhausts all cases, and completes the proof. □

We can now prove Theorem 7.3.1 under the simplifying hypothesis $R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})=0$. Recall from Remark 5.3.9 that under this hypothesis

$$\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})\cap \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \cong \bigsqcup_{\substack{m_1\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}\\ m_2\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}\\ m_1+m_2=m}} \mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r}),$$

and each stack appearing on the right has dimension zero. Proposition 7.3.2 shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\deg_{\mathbb{C}}\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}}\cdot I(\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r}):\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}) &= \frac{1}{\deg_{\mathbb{C}}\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}} \sum_{\substack{m_1\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}\\ m_2\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}\\ m_1+m_2=m}} \widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\mathtt{X}}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r})\\ &= -\sum_{\substack{m_1\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}\\ m_2\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}\\ m_1+m_2=m}} a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1,\mathfrak{r})\cdot R_\Lambda(m_2,\mathfrak{r}),\end{aligned}$$

while Corollary 6.4.3 shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\deg_{\mathbb{C}}\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}}\cdot \Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)},f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) &= -L'\big(\xi(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}),\theta_\Lambda,0\big)+c^+_{m,\mathfrak{r}}(0,0)\cdot a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(0,\mathfrak{r})\cdot R_\Lambda(0,\mathfrak{r})\\ &\quad+\sum_{\substack{m_1\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}\\ m_2\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}\\ m_1+m_2=m}} a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1,\mathfrak{r})\cdot R_\Lambda(m_2,\mathfrak{r}).\end{aligned}$$

Adding these together gives

$$\frac{1}{\deg_{\mathbb{C}}\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}}\cdot [\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}):\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] = c^+_{m,\mathfrak{r}}(0,0)\cdot a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(0,\mathfrak{r})\cdot R_\Lambda(0,\mathfrak{r})-L'\big(\xi(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}),\theta_\Lambda,0\big),$$

and an application of Theorem 7.2.4 completes the proof. Proving Theorem 7.3.1 in general requires treating improper intersections, and requires a bit more work.

7.4. **The adjunction formula.** The proof of Theorem 7.3.1 in full generality revolves around the study of a canonical section

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}\in\Gamma\big(\mathtt{Z}^{\heartsuit}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})|_{\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}}\big) \tag{7.4.1}$$

of the line bundle

$$\mathtt{Z}^{\heartsuit}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})=\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})\otimes\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}^{\otimes -R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})} \tag{7.4.2}$$

restricted to $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$. This subsection is devoted to the construction of (7.4.1), and the calculation of its divisor, which the reader may find in Proposition 7.4.9 below.

Because of the minor nuisance that the natural maps $\mathtt{Y}\to\mathtt{M}$ and $\mathtt{Z}(m,\mathfrak{r})\to\mathtt{M}$ are not closed immersions, the section (7.4.1) will be constructed by patching together sections on an étale open cover. Accordingly, we define a *sufficiently small étale open subscheme* of $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ to be a scheme $U$ together with an étale morphism $U\to\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ such that

1. on each connected component $Z\subset\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})_{/U}$ the natural map $Z\to U$ is a closed immersion,
2. on each connected component $Y\subset\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)/U}$ the natural map $Y\to U$ is a closed immersion, and the universal object $(A_0,A_1,B)$ over $Y$ satisfies $L(A_0,B)\cong\Lambda$.

As in the discussion of Section 7.1, the stack $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ admits a finite cover by sufficiently small étale open subschemes.

Fix a sufficiently small étale open subscheme $U \to \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$, and connected components

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\subset \mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})_{/U} \\ Y &\subset \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)/U}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.4.3}$$

The smoothness of $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, together with our hypotheses on $U$, imply that $Y$ is a reduced and irreducible one-dimensional closed subscheme of $U$. The closed subscheme $Z \subset U$ is perhaps neither reduced nor irreducible, but an easy deformation theory argument shows that the generic fiber of $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})$ is smooth, and hence $Z_{/\boldsymbol{k}}$ is a smooth variety of dimension $n-1$. The intersection $Z \cap Y = Z \times_U Y$ is a closed subscheme of $Y$, and hence is either all of $Y$ or is of dimension 0.

**Definition 7.4.1.** Given connected components (7.4.3), we say that

1. $Z$ is *$Y$-proper* if $Z \cap Y$ has dimension 0,
2. $Z$ is *$Y$-improper* if $Z \cap Y = Y$.

**Proposition 7.4.2.** *The number of $Y$-improper components $Z \subset \mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})_{/U}$ is $R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})$.*

*Proof.* Let $\eta \in Y$ be the generic point, so that $k(\eta)$ is a finite extension of $\boldsymbol{k}$, and let $\overline{\eta} \to \eta$ be the geometric generic point above $\eta$. Denote by $(A_{0,\eta}, A_{1,\eta}, B_\eta)$ and $(A_{0,\overline{\eta}}, A_{1,\overline{\eta}}, B_{\overline{\eta}})$ the pullbacks to $\eta$ and $\overline{\eta}$ of the universal object over $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$. The fiber

$$\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})_{\overline{\eta}} = \mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})_{/U} \times_U \overline{\eta}$$

is a disjoint union of copies of $\overline{\eta}$, one for every

$$\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1} L(A_{0,\overline{\eta}}, A_{1,\overline{\eta}} \times B_{\overline{\eta}})$$

satisfying $\langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle = m$. Under the decomposition 5.2.1, any such $\lambda$ takes the form $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$, but we must have $\lambda_1 = 0$ as there are no nonzero $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-linear maps $A_{0,\overline{\eta}} \to A_{1,\overline{\eta}}$. Indeed, such a nonzero map would induce an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-linear *isomorphism* of Lie algebras, which cannot exist as $A_{0,\overline{\eta}}$ satisfies the signature $(1,0)$ condition, while $A_{1,\overline{\eta}}$ satisfies the signature $(0,1)$ condition. Thus all such $\lambda$ lie in

$$\mathfrak{r}^{-1} L(A_{0,\overline{\eta}}, B_{\overline{\eta}}) \cong \mathfrak{r}^{-1}\Lambda,$$

and it follows that $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})_{\overline{\eta}}$ is a disjoint union of $R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})$ copies of $\overline{\eta}$. Moreover, our definition of a sufficiently small étale open guarantees that $\mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(A_{0,\eta}, B_\eta) \cong \mathfrak{r}^{-1}\Lambda$, and so all such $f$ are already defined over $\eta$. In other words, $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})_\eta$ is a disjoint union of $R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})$ copies of $\eta$. It follows that there are $R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})$ connected components of $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})_{/U}$ whose image in $U$ contains $\eta$, and the claim follows easily. □

As in the proof of Proposition 5.1.9, write $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} = \mathbb{Z}[\Pi]$ and define elements of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_U$ by

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \Pi \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \Pi \\ \overline{J} &= \overline{\Pi} \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \Pi. \end{aligned}$$

An elementary calculation shows that the sequence

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{\overline{J}} \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_U \xrightarrow{J} \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_U \xrightarrow{\overline{J}} \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_U \xrightarrow{J} \cdots . \tag{7.4.4}$$

is exact.

**Lemma 7.4.3.** *Every geometric point $y \to Y$ admits an affine étale neighborhood* $\mathrm{Spec}(R) \to U$ *over which the $R$-module* $\mathrm{Lie}(A)$ *is free, and admits a basis $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n$ such that*

1. *$\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_{n-1}$ is a basis for the universal subsheaf $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathrm{Lie}(A)$,*
2. *the operator $J$ on* $\mathrm{Lie}(A)$ *has the form*
$$J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & j_1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & j_n \end{bmatrix} \in M_n(R) \tag{7.4.5}$$
*for some $j_1, \ldots, j_n \in R$ satisfying $(j_1, \ldots, j_n) = (j_n) = \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}} R$,*
3. *there is unique $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-linear endomorphism*
$$j : \mathrm{Lie}(A) \to \mathrm{Lie}(A)$$
*such that $J = \delta_{\boldsymbol{k}} \circ j$ as endomorphisms of* $\mathrm{Lie}(A)$*,*
4. *the endomorphism $j$ preserves the subsheaf $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathrm{Lie}(A)$, and $j$ induces an automorphism of the quotient* $\mathrm{Lie}(A)/\mathcal{F}$*.*

*Here $A$ is the pullback to $R$ of the universal object via $U \to \mathtt{M} \to \mathtt{M}_{(n-1,1)}$.*

*Proof.* Certainly there is an affine étale neighborhood over which
$$0 \to \mathrm{Fil}^1(A) \to H_1^{dR}(A) \to \mathrm{Lie}(A) \to 0$$
is an exact sequence of free $R$-modules. If $\epsilon_1 \ldots, \epsilon_n$ is any basis of $H_1^{dR}(A)$ such that $\epsilon_1 \ldots, \epsilon_{n-1}$ generates $\mathcal{F}$, then the matrix of $J$ is (7.4.5) for some $j_1, \ldots, j_n \in R$, simply because $J\mathcal{F} = 0$. Futhermore, $J$ acts on the quotient $\mathrm{Lie}(A)/\mathcal{F}$ through the complex conjugate of the structure map $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \to R$, and so $j_n = \overline{\Pi} - \Pi$. It is easy to check that $(\overline{\Pi} - \Pi)\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} = \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and so $(j_n) = \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}} R$.

To prove that $(j_1, \ldots, j_n) = \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}} R$, after possibly shrinking the étale neighborhood $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$, it suffices to prove this equality after replacing $R$ by the completion of the étale local ring at $y$. We then know from the proof of [Ho3, Proposition 3.2.3] (as in the proof of Proposition 5.1.9), that the ideal $(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ is principal. Everything we have said so far holds for any geometric point of $U$. Now we exploit the hypothesis that $y$ is a geometric point of $Y$. Let $I \subset R$ be the ideal defining the closed subscheme $Y \times_U \mathrm{Spec}(R) \subset \mathrm{Spec}(R)$, and let $A'$ be the reduction of $A$ to $R/I$. By definition of the morphism $\mathtt{Y} \to \mathtt{M}$ of Section 5.2, the abelian scheme $A'$ comes with a decomposition $A' \cong A_1 \times B$, and the subsheaf $\mathcal{F}' \subset \mathrm{Lie}(A')$ is $\mathcal{F}' = \mathrm{Lie}(B)$. In particular, $\mathcal{F}'$ admits the $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-stable, and hence $J$-stable, $\mathcal{O}_Y$-direct summand $\mathrm{Lie}(A_0)$. Thus there is *some* basis of $\mathrm{Lie}(A')$ with respect to which
$$J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & j_n \end{bmatrix} \in M_n(R/I).$$

As the ideal of $R/I$ generated by the entries of $J$ is independent of the choice of basis, we see that
$$(j_1, \ldots, j_n) = (j_n) = (\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}})$$
in $R/I$. Now pick a generator $\gamma \in R$ of the principal ideal $(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$. We have shown that $(\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}) \subset (\gamma)$, with equality after reducing modulo $I$. Furthermore, $R/I$ is an integral domain of characteristic 0, as $Y$ is reduced, irreducible, and flat over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. It follows that if we write $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}} = u\gamma$ with $u \in R$, then $u$ is a unit in $R/I$, and hence is also a unit in the local ring $R$. This shows that $(j_1, \ldots, j_n) = (\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}})$ in $R$.

All remaining claims of the lemma are obvious. The only thing to note is that $\mathtt{M}$, hence also $R$, is flat over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and so $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}} \in R$ is not a zero divisor. Thus the entries of the matrix $J$ are uniquely divisible by $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. ☐

Keeping $Z$ and $Y$ as in (7.4.3), denote by $\mathcal{I}_Z \subset \mathcal{O}_U$ the ideal sheaf defining the closed subscheme $Z \hookrightarrow U$, and by $\mathcal{O}(Z) = \mathcal{I}_Z^{-1}$ the line bundle on $U$ determined by the divisor $Z$. Let $\mathcal{I}_Y \subset \mathcal{O}_U$ be the ideal sheaf defining the closed subscheme $Y \hookrightarrow U$. The *first order infinitesimal neighborhood* of $Y$ is the closed subscheme $\tilde{Y} \hookrightarrow U$ defined by the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}_Y^2 \subset \mathcal{O}_U$. The picture is

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & Z \arrow[dr] & & \\
Y \arrow[r] \arrow[urr, bend left] \arrow[drr, bend right] & \tilde{Y}\cap Z \arrow[ur] \arrow[dr] & & U \arrow[r] & \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}} \\
 & & \tilde{Y} \arrow[ur] & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\tilde{Y} \cap Z = \tilde{Y} \times_U Z$.

Let $(A_0, A, \lambda)$ be the pullback to $Y$ of the universal object over $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m, \mathfrak{r})$. Of course the pair $(A_0, A)$ has a canonical extension $(\tilde{A}_0, \tilde{A})$ to $\tilde{Y}$, obtained by pulling back the universal pair over $\mathtt{M}$ via $\tilde{Y} \to U \to \mathtt{M}$, but there is no such canonical extension of $\lambda$ to $\tilde{Y}$. Indeed, $\tilde{Y} \cap Z$ is the maximal closed subscheme of $\tilde{Y}$ over which $\lambda$ extends to an element of $\mathfrak{r}^{-1} L(\tilde{A}_0, \tilde{A})$ satisfying the vanishing condition of (5.1.2). Recall that, by virtue of the moduli problem defining $\mathtt{M}_{(n-1,1)}$, the $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}$-module $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})$ comes equipped with a corank one submodule $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. We will now construct a canonical $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}$-module map

$$\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda) : \mathrm{Fil}^1(\tilde{A}_0) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})/\tilde{\mathcal{F}},$$

the *obstruction to deforming* $\lambda$, whose zero locus is $\tilde{Y} \cap Z$. The scheme $U$ may be covered by open subschemes $\{U_i\}$ with the property that on each $U_i$ either $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r}) \in \mathcal{O}_{U_i}^\times$ or $\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{O}_{U_i} = \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \mathcal{O}_{U_i}$. In the construction of $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$ we are free to assume that $U$ itself satisfies one of these two properties.

The construction of $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$ is quite simple if $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r}) \in \mathcal{O}_U^\times$, so we treat this case first. Under this hypothesis, $\lambda$ determines an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-linear map $\lambda : H_1^{dR}(A_0) \to H_1^{dR}(A)$ of $\mathcal{O}_Y$-modules, which, by the deformation theory of [Lan, Proposition 2.1.6.4] extends canonically to an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-linear map

$$\tilde{\lambda} : H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A})$$

of $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}$-modules. Define $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$ as the composition

$$\mathrm{Fil}^1(\tilde{A}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}_0) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\lambda}} H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})/\tilde{\mathcal{F}}. \tag{7.4.6}$$

**Lemma 7.4.4.** *If* $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r}) \in \mathcal{O}_U^\times$*, the zero locus of* $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$ *is* $\tilde{Y} \cap Z$.

*Proof.* Using the notation of (7.4.6), denote by $\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)$ the composition

$$\mathrm{Fil}^1(\tilde{A}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}_0) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\lambda}} H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A}),$$

so that $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$ is the composition

$$\mathrm{Fil}^1(\tilde{A}_0) \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)} \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})/\tilde{\mathcal{F}}.$$

By deformation theory, the zero locus of $\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)$ is the maximal closed subscheme of $\tilde{Y}$ over which $\lambda$ extends to an element of $\mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(\tilde{A}_0, \tilde{A})$. For such an extension the vanishing of (5.1.2) is automatic by Remark 5.1.7, and so the zero locus of $\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)$ is $\tilde{Y} \cap Z$. Thus we are reduced proving that $\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)$ and $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$ have the same zero locus.

If $d_{\boldsymbol{k}} \in \mathcal{O}_U^\times$ the argument is simple, and exploits the splitting

$$\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}} \times \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}.$$

The orthogonal idempotents on the right hand side induce a splitting $N = eN \oplus \overline{e}N$ of any $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}$-module $N$, in which $eN$ is the maximal submodule on which $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ acts through the structure map $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \to \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}$, and $\overline{e}N$ is the maximal submodule on which $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ acts through the complex conjugate. Krämer's signature condition on $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ implies that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = e\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})$, and so $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ admits a canonical rank one $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}$-module direct summand $\overline{e}\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})$ on which $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ acts through the complex conjugate of the structure morphism. As $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ also acts on $\mathrm{Fil}^1(\tilde{A}_0)$ through the complex conjugate of the structure morphism, the image of the $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-linear map $\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)$ is contained in $\overline{e}\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A}) \cong \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})/\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. Thus $\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)$ vanishes if and only if $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$ vanishes, as desired.

Returning to the general case, clearly the zero locus of $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$ contains the zero locus of $\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)$. To prove the other inclusion, let $V \subset \tilde{Y}$ be the vanishing locus of $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$. We will prove that $\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)|_V = 0$. Fix a geometric point $y \in V(\mathbb{F})$ of $V$ and let $\boldsymbol{R}$ be the étale local ring of $V$ at $y$. Denote by $(\boldsymbol{A}_0, \boldsymbol{A})$ the pullback of $(\tilde{A}_0, \tilde{A})$ through $\mathrm{Spec}(\boldsymbol{R}) \to V \to \tilde{Y}$, and similarly denote by

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} : H_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A})$$

the pullback of $\tilde{\lambda} : H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A})$. Using Lemma 7.4.3, there is an $\boldsymbol{R}$-basis $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n$ of $\mathrm{Lie}(\boldsymbol{A})$ such that $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_{n-1}$ generates the corank one $\boldsymbol{R}$-submodule $\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{A}} \subset \mathrm{Lie}(\boldsymbol{A})$, and $J$ acts on $\mathrm{Lie}(\boldsymbol{A})$ as

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & j_1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & j_n \end{bmatrix} \in M_n(\boldsymbol{R}),$$

where $j_1, \ldots, j_n \in \boldsymbol{R}$ satisfy $(j_1, \ldots, j_n) = (j_n)$.

Fix an $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \boldsymbol{R}$-module generator $\sigma \in H_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A}_0)$, and write

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\sigma) = \lambda_1\epsilon_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n\epsilon_n \in \mathrm{Lie}(\boldsymbol{A})$$

with $\lambda_i \in \boldsymbol{R}$. Consider $\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)|_{\boldsymbol{R}}$, which is the composition

$$\mathrm{Fil}^1(\boldsymbol{A}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A}_0) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}} H_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A}_0) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\boldsymbol{A})$$

and $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)|_{\boldsymbol{R}}$, which is the composition of $\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)|_{\boldsymbol{R}}$ with the quotient map

$$\mathrm{Lie}(\boldsymbol{A}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\boldsymbol{A})/\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{A}}.$$

In particular, the image of $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)|_{\boldsymbol{R}}$ is generated by

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(J\sigma) = \lambda_n j_n \epsilon_n \in \mathrm{Lie}(\boldsymbol{A})/\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{A}}.$$

On the other hand, we know from the definition of $V$ that $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)|_{\boldsymbol{R}} = 0$, and so $\lambda_n j_n = 0$. As in the proof of Proposition 5.1.9, $\mathrm{Fil}^1(\boldsymbol{A}_0) = JH_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A}_0)$. Therefore the image of $\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)|_{\boldsymbol{R}}$ is generated by

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(J\sigma) = J \cdot \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\sigma) = \lambda_n(j_1\epsilon_1 + \cdots + j_n\epsilon_n) \in \mathrm{Lie}(\boldsymbol{A}),$$

which also vanishes, as $(j_1, \ldots, j_n) = (j_n)$ and $\lambda_n j_n = 0$. This shows that $\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)|_{\boldsymbol{R}} = 0$ for every étale local ring $\boldsymbol{R}$ of $V$, we deduce that $\boldsymbol{obst}^*(\lambda)|_V = 0$. □

We now give the construction of $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$ assuming $\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{O}_U = \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\mathcal{O}_U$. Lemma 7.4.3 implies that the $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}$-module $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})$ has a canonical $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-linear endomorphism $j$ satisfying $J = \delta_{\boldsymbol{k}} \circ j$. As the closed subscheme $Y \hookrightarrow \tilde{Y}$ is defined by a square-zero ideal sheaf, the map $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda : A_0 \to A$ induces a map

$$\widetilde{\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda} : H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}).$$

Once again using $\mathrm{Fil}^1(\tilde{A}_0) = JH_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}_0)$, define $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$ by

$$\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)(Js) = j \cdot \widetilde{\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda}(s) \in \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})/\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \tag{7.4.7}$$

for every $s \in H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}_0)$.

*Remark* 7.4.5. To see that (7.4.7) is well-defined, use the local freeness of $H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}_0)$ over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}$ and the exactness of (7.4.4). If $Js_1 = Js_2$ then $s_1 - s_2 \in \overline{J}H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}_0)$. The signature condition on $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ implies that $\overline{J}$ annihilates $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})/\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, and therefore $\widetilde{\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda}(s_1) = \widetilde{\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda}(s_2)$ in $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})/\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$.

*Remark* 7.4.6. If $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}} \in \mathcal{O}_U^\times$, so that $\mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{r}) \in \mathcal{O}_U^\times$ and $\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{O}_U = \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\mathcal{O}_U$, then the constructions (7.4.6) and (7.4.7) agree.

**Lemma 7.4.7.** *If $\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{O}_U = \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\mathcal{O}_U$, the zero locus of $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$ is $\tilde{Y} \cap Z$.*

*Proof.* Recall that $\tilde{Y} \cap Z$ is the maximal closed subscheme of $\tilde{Y}$ over which $\lambda$ extends to an element of $\mathfrak{r}^{-1}L(\tilde{A}_0, \tilde{A})$ satisfying the vanishing of (5.1.2). By deformation theory, this is the same as the maximal closed subscheme over which the compositions

$$\mathrm{Fil}^1(\tilde{A}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}) \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda}} H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})$$

and

$$H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}_0) \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}}\lambda}} H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}_0) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})/\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$$

vanish. Using $J\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = 0$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^1(\tilde{A}_0) = JH_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}_0)$, one easily checks that the vanishing of the second composition implies the vanishing of the first. Using the invertibility of $j$ on $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})/\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, the vanishing of the second composition is equivalent to the vanishing of $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$, completing the proof of the lemma. □

The following result is reminiscent of the classical adjunction isomorphism as in [Liu, Lemma 9.1.36], however our result is particular to the moduli space $\mathtt{M}$. Indeed, it is a statement about the cotautological bundle $\mathtt{T}$, which we have defined using the moduli interpretation of $\mathtt{M}$.

**Theorem 7.4.8** (Adjunction)**.** *Assuming that $Z$ is $Y$-improper, there is a canonical isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{O}(Z)|_Y \cong \mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}|_Y \tag{7.4.8}$$

*of line bundles on $Y$.*

*Proof.* View the obstruction

$$\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda) : \mathrm{Fil}^1(\tilde{A}_0) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{A})/\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$$

as a section

$$\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda) \in \Gamma(\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}|_{\tilde{Y}})$$

with zero locus $\tilde{Y} \cap Z$. Under the inclusion $\mathcal{O}_U \subset \mathcal{O}(Z)$ of $\mathcal{O}_U$-modules, the constant function 1 on $U$ defines a section $\boldsymbol{s} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{O}(Z))$ with zero locus $Z$. Hence the restriction $\boldsymbol{s}|_{\tilde{Y}} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{O}(Z)|_{\tilde{Y}})$ also has zero locus $\tilde{Y} \cap Z$.

After passing to a Zariski open cover of $U$, we are free to assume that $U = \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ is affine, and that the line bundles $\mathcal{O}(Z)$ and $\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}|_U$ are trivial. Fix isomorphisms of $R$-modules $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}(Z)) \cong R$ and $\Gamma(\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}|_U) \cong R$, and let $I \subset R$ be the ideal defining the closed subscheme $Y \subset U$. Note that $R/I$ is an integral domain of characteristic 0. Let $f, g \in R/I^2$ be the elements corresponding to the sections $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$ and $\boldsymbol{s}|_{\tilde{Y}}$. As these sections have the same zero locus, $(f) = (g)$ and we may write $f = vg$ and $g = uf$ for some $u, v \in R/I^2$. In particular $g \cdot (1 - uv) = 0$.

Suppose we have some $x \in R/I^2$ satisfying $gx = 0$. The claim is that $x \in I/I^2$. Suppose not. The element $g \in R/I^2$ comes with a lift to $R$, defined by $\boldsymbol{s}$, and we fix any lift of $x$ to $R$, necessarily with $x \notin I$. In particular $x$ is a unit in the localization $R_I$. Therefore $g \in I^2 R_I$ and the natural surjection $R_I \to R_I/(g)$ induces an isomorphism on tangent spaces. This is a contradiction, as we know from the smoothness of the generic fibers of $U$ and $Z$ that the completed local rings of $R_I$ and $R_I/(g)$ are power series rings (over some finite extension of $\boldsymbol{k}$) in $n-1$ and $n-2$ variables, respectively.

If we apply the above to $x = 1 - uv$ we see that $1 = uv$ in $R/I$. Therefore the map

$$\Gamma(\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}|_{\tilde{Y}}) \cong R/I^2 \xrightarrow{u} R/I^2 \cong \Gamma(\mathcal{O}(Z)|_{\tilde{Y}}),$$

which takes $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda) \mapsto \boldsymbol{s}|_{\tilde{Y}}$, becomes an isomorphism after tensoring with $R/I \cong \mathcal{O}_Y$. Although $g = uf$ does not determine $u$ uniquely, any other such $u$ has the same image in $R/I$. In view of the discussion above, the desired isomorphism (7.4.8) may be defined as follows: there is some homomorphism

$$\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}|_{\tilde{Y}} \to \mathcal{O}(Z)|_{\tilde{Y}}$$

satisfying $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda) \mapsto \boldsymbol{s}|_{\tilde{Y}}$. Such a homomorphism is not unique, but any two have the same restriction to $Y$, and this restriction is an isomorphism. □

At last we construct the promised section (7.4.1). Fix one connected component $Y \subset \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)/U}$, and regard $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})$ as a line bundle on $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$. Its pullback to a line bundle on $U$ satisfies

$$\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})|_U \cong \bigotimes_Z \mathcal{O}(Z),$$

where the tensor product is over all connected components $Z \subset \mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})_{/U}$. Combining the adjunction isomorphism (7.4.8) with Proposition 7.4.2 yields an isomorphism

$$\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}^{R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})}|_Y \cong \bigotimes_{Y\text{-improper } Z} \mathcal{O}(Z)|_Y,$$

and hence an isomorphism

$$\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})|_Y \cong \mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}^{R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})}|_Y \otimes \bigotimes_{Y\text{-proper } Z} \mathcal{O}(Z)|_Y,$$

which we rewrite as

$$\mathtt{Z}^{\heartsuit}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})|_Y \cong \bigotimes_{Y\text{-proper } Z} \mathcal{O}(Z)|_Y. \tag{7.4.9}$$

Each line bundle $\mathcal{O}(Z) \supset \mathcal{O}_U$ has a canonical section $\boldsymbol{s} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{O}(Z))$, corresponding to the constant function 1 in $\mathcal{O}_U$, satisfying

$$\mathrm{div}(\boldsymbol{s}|_Y) = \mathrm{div}(\boldsymbol{s}) \cap Y = Z \cap Y$$

as divisors on $Y$. Therefore (7.4.9) determines a section

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}|_Y \in \Gamma(\mathtt{Z}^{\heartsuit}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})|_Y)$$

corresponding to the section $\otimes \boldsymbol{s}|_Y$ on the right hand side of (7.4.9), and this section satisfies

$$\mathrm{div}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}|_Y) = \sum_{Y\text{-proper } Z} (Z \cap Y). \tag{7.4.10}$$

Note that each $\boldsymbol{s}|_Y$ appearing in the tensor product is nonvanishing at the generic point of $Y$, precisely because the tensor product is over only the $Y$-proper $Z$'s. In particular $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}|_Y$ is nonzero.

By repeating the above construction on each connected component $Y$ of $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)/U}$ we obtain a section of the pullback of $\mathtt{Z}^{\heartsuit}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})$ to $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)/U}$. As $U$ varies over a cover of $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ by sufficiently small étale opens, these sections (being truly canonical) agree on the overlaps, and the desired section (7.4.1) is defined by patching them together.

**Proposition 7.4.9.** *As divisors on* $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$*, we have*

$$\mathrm{div}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) = \sum_{\substack{m_1 \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \\ m_2 \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \\ m_1+m_2=m}} \mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r}).$$

*Proof.* As in the construction of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$, fix a sufficiently small étale open subscheme $U \to \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ and a connected component $Y \subset \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)/U}$. It follows from (5.3.2) that there is an isomorphism of $Y$-schemes

$$\bigsqcup_Z (Z \cap Y) \cong \bigsqcup_{\substack{m_1,m_2 \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \\ m_1+m_2=m}} \mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r})_{/Y}$$

where the disjoint union on the left is over all connected components $Z \subset \mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r})_{/U}$. Each side of this isomorphism has a well-defined 0-dimensional part: the disjoint union of all its 0-dimensional connected components. Taking the 0-dimensional parts, using Theorem 5.3.2 and Proposition 5.3.8 for the right hand side, and then viewing the 0-dimension parts as divisors on $Y$, we find

$$\sum_{Y\text{-proper } Z} (Z \cap Y) = \sum_{\substack{m_1 \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \\ m_2 \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \\ m_1+m_2=m}} \mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r})_{/Y}.$$

Combining this with (7.4.10) shows that

$$\mathrm{div}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}})_{/Y} = \sum_{\substack{m_1 \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \\ m_2 \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \\ m_1+m_2=m}} \mathtt{X}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1,m_2,\mathfrak{r})_{/Y},$$

and the claim follows immediately. □

7.5. **Adjunction in the complex fiber.** Fix one point $y \in \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})$. We will give a purely analytic construction of the fiber of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ at $y$ using the complex uniformization (6.1.2). Recall from Section 6.1 that to the point $y$ there is associated a triple $(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}_1, \mathfrak{B})$ of hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-modules such that $L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{B}) \cong \Lambda$ and

$$L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}_1) \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}_0(\infty)).$$

Set $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{B}$ so that $L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}(\infty))$ and

$$L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \cong L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}_1) \oplus \Lambda.$$

Recall that the connected component of $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$ containing $y$ admits an orbifold presentation

$$\Gamma\backslash\mathcal{D} \to \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$$

in which $\mathcal{D}$ is the space of negative lines in $L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})_{\mathbb{R}}$, and that under this presentation the point $y$ corresponds to the negative line

$$L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}_1)_{\mathbb{R}} \subset L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

Denote by $Z(m, \mathfrak{r})$ the pullback to $\mathcal{D}$ of the divisor $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(m, \mathfrak{r})$. By (6.1.4) the corresponding line bundle is

$$Z(m, \mathfrak{r}) \cong \bigotimes_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1} L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \\ \langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle = m}} \mathcal{O}(\lambda). \tag{7.5.1}$$

On the right hand side $\mathcal{O}(\lambda)$ is the line bundle on $\mathcal{D}$ defined by the divisor $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)$ of negative lines orthogonal to $\lambda$. We must explain the meaning of the infinite tensor product on the right. Denote by $\boldsymbol{s}(\lambda)$ the constant function 1 on $\mathcal{D}$, viewed as a section of $\mathcal{O}(\lambda)$. For any open set $U \subset \mathcal{D}$ with compact closure there are only finitely many $\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1} L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})$ satisfying $\langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle = m$ for which $\mathcal{D}(\lambda) \cap U \neq \emptyset$. For $\lambda$ not in this finite set the section $\boldsymbol{s}(\lambda)$ is nonvanishing on $U$, and defines a trivialization of $\mathcal{O}(\lambda)$. Thus, after restricting to any such $U$ all but finitely many of the factors of (7.5.1) are trivialized, and the meaning of (7.5.1) is clear. The line bundle (7.5.1) has a canonical section

$$\boldsymbol{s}_{m,\mathfrak{r}} = \bigotimes_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1} L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \\ \langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle = m}} \boldsymbol{s}(\lambda)$$

corresponding to the constant function 1 in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}} \subset Z(m, \mathfrak{r})$.

Let $T$ denote the pullback of the cotautological bundle $\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}$ to $\mathcal{D}$. The irreducible components of the divisor $Z(m, \mathfrak{r})$ passing through $y$ are indexed by the set

$$\{\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}\Lambda : \langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle = m\} \subset L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}). \tag{7.5.2}$$

Recall from Remark 7.2.3 that at every point $z \in \mathcal{D}$ there is a canonical isomorphism

$$T_z \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(z, \mathbb{C}),$$

which was called $f_z^\vee$, but which we now suppress from the notation. For each $z \in \mathcal{D}$ and each $\lambda$ in (7.5.2), denote by $\lambda_z$ the orthogonal projection of $\lambda$ to $z$. There is a unique holomorphic section $\boldsymbol{obst}^{\mathrm{an}}(\lambda) \in \Gamma(\mathcal{D}, T)$ whose fiber at every point $z$ satisfies

$$\boldsymbol{obst}_z^{\mathrm{an}}(\lambda) = \langle \cdot, \lambda_z \rangle.$$

Of course the zero locus of $\boldsymbol{obst}^{\mathrm{an}}(\lambda)$ is the divisor $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)$, and hence there is a unique isomorphism of line bundles $\mathcal{O}(\lambda) \cong T$ satisfying $\boldsymbol{s}(\lambda) \mapsto \boldsymbol{obst}^{\mathrm{an}}(\lambda)$. This isomorphism is the analytic analogue of the adjunction isomorphism of Theorem 7.4.8.

Define a holomorphic section

$$\boldsymbol{obst}^{\mathrm{an}}_{m,\mathfrak{r}} = \bigotimes_{\substack{\lambda\in\mathfrak{r}^{-1}\Lambda \\ \langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle=m}} \boldsymbol{obst}^{\mathrm{an}}(\lambda)$$

of

$$T^{R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})} = \bigotimes_{\substack{\lambda\in\mathfrak{r}^{-1}\Lambda \\ \langle\lambda,\lambda\rangle=m}} T.$$

The pullback of (7.4.2) to $\mathcal{D}$ is

$$Z^{\heartsuit}(m,\mathfrak{r}) \cong Z(m,\mathfrak{r}) \otimes T^{\otimes -R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})}, \tag{7.5.3}$$

which has the holomorphic section $\boldsymbol{s}_{m,\mathfrak{r}} \otimes (\boldsymbol{obst}^{\mathrm{an}}_{m,\mathfrak{r}})^{-1}$.

**Lemma 7.5.1.** *The fiber at $y$ of $\boldsymbol{s}_{m,\mathfrak{r}} \otimes (\boldsymbol{obst}^{\mathrm{an}}_{m,\mathfrak{r}})^{-1}$ agrees with the fiber at $y$ of the section $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$.*

*Proof.* The main thing to explain is the relation between the analytically constructed section $\boldsymbol{obst}^{\mathrm{an}}(\lambda)$ and the algebraically constructed section $\boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$ of the previous subsection. We will express both constructions in terms of parallel transport with respect to the Gauss-Manin connection. Let $\boldsymbol{R} = \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathcal{D},y}$ be the completion of the ring of germs of holomorphic functions at $y$. Equivalently, $\boldsymbol{R}$ is the completed étale local ring of $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}/\mathbb{C}}$ at $y$, a power series ring over $\mathbb{C}$ in $n-1$ variables. Let $(A_0, A) \in \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$ be the pair represented by the point $y$, and let $(\boldsymbol{A}_0, \boldsymbol{A})$ be the universal deformation of $(A_0, A)$ over $\boldsymbol{R}$. If $\mathfrak{m} \subset \boldsymbol{R}$ is the maximal ideal, set $\tilde{R} = \boldsymbol{R}/\mathfrak{m}^2$. Thus $\mathrm{Spec}(\tilde{R})$ is the first order infinitesimal neighborhood of $y$. Denote by $(\tilde{A}_0, \tilde{A})$ the reduction of $(\boldsymbol{A}_0, \boldsymbol{A})$ to $\tilde{R}$. Let

$$\boldsymbol{T} = \mathrm{Hom}_{\boldsymbol{R}}(\mathrm{Fil}^1(\boldsymbol{A}_0), \mathrm{Lie}(\boldsymbol{A})/\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{A}})$$

be the pullback to $\boldsymbol{R}$ of the cotautological bundle, and let $\tilde{T}$ be its reduction to $\tilde{R}$.

Each $\lambda$ in the set (7.5.2) determines a $\mathbb{C}$-linear map $\lambda : H_1^{dR}(A_0) \to H_1^{dR}(A)$, which, using the Gauss-Manin connection, has a canonical deformation

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} : H_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A})$$

defined by parallel transport. See [Lan] and [Vo] for the Gauss-Manin connection, and [BeOg] for the algebraic theory of parallel transport. The composition

$$\mathrm{Fil}^1(\boldsymbol{A}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A}_0) \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} H_1^{dR}(\boldsymbol{A}) \to \mathrm{Lie}(\boldsymbol{A})/\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{A}},$$

viewed as an element of $\boldsymbol{T}$, is precisely the pullback of $\boldsymbol{obst}^{\mathrm{an}}(\lambda)$ to $\boldsymbol{T}$. On the other hand, the reduction of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ to $\tilde{R}$ is precisely the map

$$\tilde{\lambda} : H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A}_0) \to H_1^{dR}(\tilde{A})$$

appearing in (7.4.6). Thus the reduction map $\boldsymbol{T} \to \tilde{T}$ sends $\boldsymbol{obst}^{\mathrm{an}}(\lambda) \mapsto \boldsymbol{obst}(\lambda)$. With this in mind, the rest of the proof follows by tracing through the definitions of the two sections in question. ☐

Define a metrized line bundle on $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ by

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\heartsuit}_{\mathscr{L}}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) = \widehat{\mathtt{Z}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) \otimes \widehat{\mathtt{T}}^{\otimes -R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})}_{\mathscr{L}}. \tag{7.5.4}$$

**Proposition 7.5.2.** *For any point $y \in \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})$, the section $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ constructed in Section 7.4 satisfies*

$$-\log ||\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}||_y^2 = \Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(y, f_{m,\mathfrak{r}})$$

*with respect to the metric on $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}^{\heartsuit}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}})|_y$ determined by (7.5.4).*

*Proof.* The metrized line bundle (7.5.4) pulls back to a metrized line bundle on $\mathcal{D}$, whose underlying line bundle is (7.5.3). It is easy to compute the norm of the section $\boldsymbol{s}_{m,\mathfrak{r}} \otimes (\boldsymbol{obst}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}^{\mathrm{an}})^{-1}$ with respect to this metric. For any $z \in \mathcal{D}$ not contained in the support of $Z(m, \mathfrak{r})$, the section $\boldsymbol{s}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ satisfies

$$-\log ||\boldsymbol{s}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}||_z^2 = \Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(z, f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}),$$

by definition of the metric on $\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}})$, while

$$\log ||\boldsymbol{obst}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}^{\mathrm{an}}||_z^2 = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}\Lambda \\ \langle \lambda,\lambda\rangle = m}} \log ||\boldsymbol{obst}^{\mathrm{an}}(\lambda)||_z^2 = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}\Lambda \\ \langle \lambda,\lambda\rangle = m}} \big( \log |\langle \lambda_z, \lambda_z \rangle| + \log(4\pi) + \gamma \big),$$

by definition (7.2.1) of the metric on $\widehat{\mathtt{T}}_{\mathscr{L}}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} -\log ||\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}||_y^2 &= \lim_{z \to y} \big( -\log ||\boldsymbol{s}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}||_z^2 + \log ||\boldsymbol{obst}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}^{\mathrm{an}}||_z^2 \big) \\ &= \lim_{z \to y} \Big( \Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(z, f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) + \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}^{-1}\Lambda \\ \langle \lambda,\lambda\rangle = m}} \big( \log |\langle \lambda_z, \lambda_z \rangle| + \log(4\pi) + \gamma \big) \Big). \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 3.3.2, this is the value at $y$ of the (discontinuous) function $\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(z, f_{m,\mathfrak{r}})$. □

7.6. **Completion of the proof.** Again we consider the metrized line bundle

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}_{\mathscr{L}}^{\heartsuit}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) = \widehat{\mathtt{Z}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) \otimes \widehat{\mathtt{T}}_{\mathscr{L}}^{\otimes - R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})}$$

on $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$. Its restriction to $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ has a canonical nonzero section (7.4.1), which, as in Section 7.1, determines an arithmetic divisor

$$\widehat{\mathrm{div}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) = (\mathrm{div}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}), -\log ||\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}||^2) \in \widehat{\mathrm{Div}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)})$$

satisfying

$$[\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}_{\mathscr{L}}^{\heartsuit}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) : \mathtt{Y}_{\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda}] = \widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\mathrm{div}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}).$$

Of course this relation holds for *any* nonzero section of the restriction of $\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}_{\mathscr{L}}^{\heartsuit}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}})$ to $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$. The advantage of the section $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ of (7.4.1) is that its construction is sufficiently explicit to allow for the calculation of its arithmetic degree. Indeed, Proposition 7.4.9 implies that the arithmetic divisor

$$\widehat{\mathrm{div}}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) = (\mathrm{div}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}), 0)$$

satisfies

$$\widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\mathrm{div}}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) = \sum_{\substack{m_1 \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \\ m_2 \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \\ m_1 + m_2 = m}} \widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\mathtt{X}}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(m_1, m_2, \mathfrak{r}). \tag{7.6.1}$$

On the other hand, it is immediate from Proposition 7.5.2 that the arithmetic divisor

$$\widehat{\mathrm{div}}_{\infty}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) = (0, -\log ||\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}||^2)$$

satisfies

$$\widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\mathrm{div}}_{\infty}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) = \Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}, f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}). \tag{7.6.2}$$

At last we have all the necessary ingredients to prove Theorem 7.3.1.

*Proof of Theorem 7.3.1.* Combining (7.6.1) with Proposition 7.3.2 shows that

$$\widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\operatorname{div}}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) = -\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \sum_{\substack{m_1\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}\\ m_2\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}\\ m_1+m_2=m}} a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1,\mathfrak{r})\cdot R_\Lambda(m_2,\mathfrak{r}).$$

The $m_1=0$ term absent from the right hand side instead appears in the equality

$$[\widehat{\mathtt{T}}^{\otimes R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})}_{\mathscr{L}} : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] = -\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}\cdot a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(0,\mathfrak{r})\cdot R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})$$

of Theorem 7.2.4, and combining all of this with (7.6.2) gives the final equality in

$$\begin{aligned}
[\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] &= [\widehat{\mathtt{T}}^{\otimes R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})}_{\mathscr{L}} : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] + [\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\heartsuit}_{\mathscr{L}}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}]\\
&= [\widehat{\mathtt{T}}^{\otimes R_\Lambda(m,\mathfrak{r})}_{\mathscr{L}} : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] + \widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\operatorname{div}}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) + \widehat{\deg}\ \widehat{\operatorname{div}}_{\infty}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{m,\mathfrak{r}})\\
&= \Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}, f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) - \deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}\\ m_1+m_2=m}} a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1,\mathfrak{r})\cdot R_\Lambda(m_2,\mathfrak{r}).
\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 6.4.3 shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}}\cdot \Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}, f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) = -L'\big(\xi(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}),\theta_\Lambda,0\big) + c^+_{m,\mathfrak{r}}(0,0)\cdot a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(0,\mathfrak{r})\cdot R_\Lambda(0,\mathfrak{r})\\
+ \sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}\\ m_1+m_2=m}} a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(m_1,\mathfrak{r})\cdot R_\Lambda(m_2,\mathfrak{r}),
\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\frac{1}{\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}}\cdot [\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] = -L'\big(\xi(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}),\theta_\Lambda,0\big) + c^+_{m,\mathfrak{r}}(0,0)\cdot a^+_{\mathscr{L}_0}(0,\mathfrak{r})\cdot R_\Lambda(0,\mathfrak{r}).$$

Another application of Theorem 7.2.4 then shows that

$$[\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] = -\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}\cdot L'\big(\xi(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}),\theta_\Lambda,0\big) - c^+_{m,\mathfrak{r}}(0,0)\cdot [\widehat{\mathtt{T}}_{\mathscr{L}} : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}],$$

and completes the proof. ☐

## 8. ARITHMETIC CYCLES CLASSES AND DERIVATIVES OF $L$-FUNCTIONS

Throughout Section 8 we fix a pair $(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)$ as in Sections 6 and 7, and set $\mathscr{L}=\mathscr{L}_0\oplus\Lambda$ as in Remark 5.2.3. Let $\Delta$ be the automorphism group of the finite quadratic space $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$, and fix a $\Delta$-invariant harmonic Maass form $f\in H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})$ with holomorphic part

$$f^+(\tau) = \sum_{\substack{m\in\mathbb{Q}\\ m\gg 0}} c^+(m)\cdot q^m. \tag{8.0.3}$$

The goal of Section 8 is to reformulate Theorem 7.3.1 in terms of the arithmetic Chow group of the canonical toroidal compactification of $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$, and to explain the connection with arithmetic theta lifts in the sense of Kudla.

8.1. **Compactification and the arithmetic Chow group.** The moduli space $\mathtt{M}_{(n-1,1)}$ defined in Section 5.1 admits a canonical toroidal compactification $\mathtt{M}^*_{(n-1,1)}$. Over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}[1/d_{\boldsymbol{k}}]$ the construction is found in [Lan]; the extension to $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is contained in [Ho3]. The $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-stack

$$\mathtt{M}^* = \mathtt{M}_{(1,0)} \times \mathtt{M}^*_{(n-1,1)}$$

is regular, proper and flat over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ of relative dimension $n-1$, and smooth over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}[1/d_{\boldsymbol{k}}]$. It contains $\mathtt{M}$ as a dense open substack, and the boundary $\mathtt{M}^* \smallsetminus \mathtt{M}$, when endowed with its reduced substack structure, is proper and smooth over $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ of relative dimension $n-2$. Exactly as in (5.1.7), there is a decomposition

$$\mathtt{M}^* = \bigsqcup_{\mathscr{L}} \mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$$

in which $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$ is, by definition, the Zariski closure of $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ in $\mathtt{M}^*$.

Let $\widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}})$ be the arithmetic Chow group with real coefficients and log-log growth along the boundary in the sense of Burgos-Kramer-Kühn [BKK, BBK]. For concreteness, we use the definition of [Ho3, Section 3.1] (which is slightly different from [BKK, BBK]; see [Ho3, Remark 3.1.4]). The canonical map $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \to \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$, induces a linear functional

$$\widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}) \to \mathbb{R},$$

the *arithmetic degree along* $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$, defined in [Ho3, Section 3.1] and denoted $\widehat{\mathtt{Z}} \mapsto [\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}, \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}]$. Extend this functional $\mathbb{C}$-linearly to

$$\widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}) = \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}.$$

Let $\mathtt{B}_{\mathscr{L}} = \mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}} \smallsetminus \mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$ be the boundary of $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$. We will now define a divisor $\mathtt{B}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ on $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$, supported on $\mathtt{B}_{\mathscr{L}}$. As the boundary is smooth, it suffices to assign a multiplicity to each connected component of the generic fiber $\mathtt{B}_{\mathscr{L}/\boldsymbol{k}}$. Start with a component $\mathtt{C}$ of the geometric fiber $\mathtt{B}_{\mathscr{L}/\boldsymbol{k}^{\mathrm{alg}}}$. This component lies on some connected component of $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}/\boldsymbol{k}^{\mathrm{alg}}}$, which, as in Section 6.1, corresponds to a pair $(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A})$ with $L(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}) \in \mathrm{gen}(\mathscr{L}(\infty))$. As in Section 4, the component $\mathtt{C}$ then corresponds to the $\Gamma_{(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})}$-orbit of an isotropic $\boldsymbol{k}$-line $I \subset L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Let $\mathfrak{a} = I \cap L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})$. By Lemma 4.3.1 there is a decomposition

$$L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}) = E(\mathtt{C}) \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{b}$$

in which $\mathfrak{b}$ is an isotropic $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-submodule of rank one, and $E(\mathtt{C})$ is orthogonal to $\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{b}$. Under any such decomposition, $E(\mathtt{C})$ is a self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module of signature $(n-2, 0)$. The *multiplicity of* $\mathtt{C}$ *with respect to* $f$ is defined, in accordance with (4.3.3) and Remark 4.3.4, as follows. If $n > 2$ then

$$\mathrm{mult}_{\mathtt{C}}(f) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}} \frac{m}{n-2} \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1} E(\mathtt{C}) \\ \langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle = m}} \sum_{\nu \in \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{a}} c^+(-m, \lambda + \nu), \tag{8.1.1}$$

where $c^+(-m)$ is viewed as a function on

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1} E(\mathtt{C})/E(\mathtt{C}) \oplus \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1} L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A})/L(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}) \cong \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f.$$

If $n = 2$ then $E(\mathtt{C}) = 0$, and in view of the second formula of Remark 4.3.4 we instead define

$$\mathrm{mult}_{\mathtt{C}}(f) = -2 \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \sum_{\nu \in \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{a}} c^+(-m, \nu)\sigma_1(m). \tag{8.1.2}$$

Exactly as in [Ho3, Section 3.7], the isomorphism class of the hermitian module $E(\mathtt{C})$ is constant on the $\mathrm{Gal}(\boldsymbol{k}^{\mathrm{alg}}/\boldsymbol{k})$-orbit of $\mathtt{C}$, and so summing over all geometric components $\mathtt{C}$ yields a divisor

$$\mathtt{B}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)=\sum_{\mathtt{C}}\mathrm{mult}_{\mathtt{C}}(f)\cdot\mathtt{C}$$

on $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}/\boldsymbol{k}}$. Denote in the same way the divisor on $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$ obtained by taking the Zariski closure.

Let $\mathtt{Z}^*_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ be the Zariski closure in $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$ of the Kudla-Rapoport divisor $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$, and define the *total Kudla-Rapoport divisor*

$$\mathtt{Z}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)=\mathtt{Z}^*_{\mathscr{L}}(f)+\mathtt{B}_{\mathscr{L}}(f).$$

The analysis, carried out in Section 4.4, of the Green function $\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(f)$ near the boundary shows that the pair

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)=\big(\mathtt{Z}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f),\Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(f)\big)$$

defines a class in $\widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}})$.

The universal abelian scheme $A^{\mathrm{univ}}\to\mathtt{M}_{(n-1,1)}$ extends to a semi-abelian scheme $A^*\to\mathtt{M}^*_{(n-1,1)}$, and the universal subsheaf $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{univ}}\subset\mathrm{Lie}(A^{\mathrm{univ}})$ extends canonically to a subsheaf $\mathcal{F}^*\subset\mathrm{Lie}(A^*)$ by [Ho3, Theorem 2.5.2]. The cotautological bundle $\mathtt{T}$ of Section 7.2 therefore extends to a line bundle

$$\mathtt{T}^*=\mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{Fil}^1(A_0^{\mathrm{univ}}),\mathrm{Lie}(A^*)/\mathcal{F}^*)$$

on $\mathtt{M}^*$, and the restriction of $\mathtt{T}^*$ to $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$ is denoted $\mathtt{T}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$. Fix a rational section $\boldsymbol{s}$ of $\mathtt{T}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$, and recall the metric (7.2.1) on $\mathtt{T}_{\mathscr{L}}$. It follows from the proof of Theorem 4.3.3 (see especially step 2) that

$$\widehat{\mathrm{div}}(\boldsymbol{s})=(\mathrm{div}(\boldsymbol{s}),-\log||\boldsymbol{s}||^2)$$

is an arithmetic divisor on $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$ in the sense of [Ho3, Section 3.1], and defines a class

$$\widehat{\mathtt{T}}^*_{\mathscr{L}}\in\widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}),$$

which does not depend on the choice of $\boldsymbol{s}$.

### 8.2. **The main result, first form.**

Theorem 7.3.1 relates the central derivative of a Rankin-Selberg $L$-function to the arithmetic intersection against $\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}$ of a certain metrized line bundle on the open Shimura variety $\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}$. We now reformulate this result in terms of the arithmetic Chow group of the compactified Shimura variety $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$.

**Definition 8.2.1.** The *arithmetic theta lift of $f$* is the class

$$\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)=\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f)+c^+(0,0)\cdot\widehat{\mathtt{T}}^*_{\mathscr{L}}\in\widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}).$$

**Theorem 8.2.2.** *The arithmetic theta lift satisfies*

$$[\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f):\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}]=-\deg_{\mathbb{C}}\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}\cdot L'(\xi(f),\theta_\Lambda,0),$$

*where*

$$\xi:H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})\to S_n(\overline{\omega}_{\mathscr{L}}).$$

*the complex-conjugate-linear homomorphism of (2.2.3).*

*Proof.* If $f = f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$ then this is immediate from Theorem 7.3.1. If $f = c^+(0)$ is a constant function (this can only happen when $n = 2$) then $\mathtt{Z}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) = 0$ and Theorems 6.4.1 and 7.2.4 imply

$$\begin{aligned}[\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] &= \Phi_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}, f) + c^+(0,0)\cdot[\widehat{\mathtt{T}}_{\mathscr{L}} : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] \\ &= -\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \cdot L'(\xi(f), \theta_\Lambda, 0) \\ &\quad + \deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \cdot \{c^+(0), \mathcal{E}_{\mathscr{L}_0} \otimes \theta_\Lambda\} + c^+(0,0)\cdot[\widehat{\mathtt{T}}_{\mathscr{L}} : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] \\ &= -\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \cdot L'(\xi(f), \theta_\Lambda, 0).\end{aligned}$$

The general case now follows from Lemma 6.2.3. ☐

8.3. **A modularity conjecture.** In this subsection we assume either that $n > 2$, or that $n = 2$ and $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}$ is not isotropic in the sense of Section 6.2. In the case we are excluding, in which $n = 2$ and $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}$ is isotropic, recall that there was some ambiguity in the definition of $f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$, removed by fiat in Remark 6.2.2, and an unwanted constant term in the decomposition of Lemma 6.2.3.

**Conjecture 8.3.1.** *If* $\xi(f) = 0$ *then* $\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) = 0$.

Of course the conjecture implies that the arithmetic theta lift

$$\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}} : H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^{\Delta} \to \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}{}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}})$$

factors through $\xi$ to define a complex-conjugate-linear homomorphism (denoted the same way)

$$\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}} : S_n(\overline{\omega}_{\mathscr{L}})^{\Delta} \to \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}{}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}).$$

We now give an alternate interpretation of the arithmetic theta lift, in the spirit of Kudla [Ku4]. For any positive $m \in \mathbb{Q}$ and any divisor $\mathfrak{r} \mid \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, define the *total arithmetic Kudla-Rapoport divisor*

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r}) = \widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}) \in \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}{}^1(\mathtt{M}_{\mathscr{L}}).$$

Extend the definition to $m = 0$ by setting

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(0,\mathfrak{r}) = \widehat{\mathtt{T}}^*_{\mathscr{L}}.$$

Next, define a function

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(m) : S_{\mathscr{L}} \to \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}{}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}})$$

by the following rule: given any $\Delta$-invariant $\varphi \in S_{\mathscr{L}}$, decompose

$$\varphi = \sum_{\substack{k\in\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} \\ \mathfrak{r}\mid\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}} \alpha_{k,\mathfrak{r}} \cdot \varphi_{k,\mathfrak{r}}$$

as a linear combination of the functions $\varphi_{k,\mathfrak{r}} \in S_{\mathscr{L}}$ of Section 6.2, and define

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\varphi) = \sum_{\mathfrak{r}\mid\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \alpha_{m,\mathfrak{r}} \cdot \widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(m,\mathfrak{r}).$$

Extend the definition to arbitrary $\varphi \in S_{\mathscr{L}}$ by first projecting to the subspace of $\Delta$-invariants. If we view these functions as elements

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(m) \in S^{\vee}_{\mathscr{L}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}{}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}),$$

then the equality

$$\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) = \sum_{m \geq 0} \left\{ c^+(-m), \widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(m) \right\} \in \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}) \tag{8.3.1}$$

is trivially verified when $f = f_{m,\mathfrak{r}}$, and so holds for all $f$ by Lemma 6.2.3.

**Conjecture 8.3.2.** *The formal generating series*

$$\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(\tau) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}} \widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(m) \cdot q^m, \tag{8.3.2}$$

*valued in* $S^\vee_{\mathscr{L}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}})$*, is a modular form of weight* $n$ *and representation* $\omega^\vee_{\mathscr{L}}$*. More precisely, (8.3.2) is the* $q$*-expansion of a function*

$$\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}} \in M_n(\omega^\vee_{\mathscr{L}}) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}).$$

Note that (8.3.1) is simply the constant term of the formal $q$-expansion $\{f^+, \widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}\}$.

**Proposition 8.3.3.** *Conjectures 8.3.2 and 8.3.1 are equivalent. If these conjectures are true, then for any* $F \in S_n(\overline{\omega}_{\mathscr{L}})^\Delta$ *the arithmetic theta lift* $\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(F)$ *is equal to the Petersson inner product*

$$\langle F, \widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}} \rangle = \int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathbb{H}} \{ \overline{F}(\tau), \widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(\tau) \} \, v^{2-n} du \, dv.$$

*Proof.* A theorem of Borcherds [Bo2, Theorem 3.1] implies that Conjecture 8.3.2 is equivalent to the vanishing of (8.3.1) for every $f \in M^!_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}})^\Delta$. By the exactness of (2.2.4), this is equivalent to Conjecture 8.3.1. The final claim follows from [BF, Proposition 3.5]. □

The following theorem provides some evidence for Conjecture 8.3.2. Similarly, the right hand side of Theorem 8.2.2 obviously vanishes if $\xi(f) = 0$, providing evidence for Conjecture 8.3.1.

**Theorem 8.3.4.** *The* $S^\vee_{\mathscr{L}}$ *valued generating series*

$$[\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(\tau) : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)}] = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}} [\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(m) : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)}] \cdot q^m$$

*is a holomorphic modular form of weight* $n$ *and representation* $\omega^\vee_{\mathscr{L}}$*.*

*Proof.* Using the modularity criterion of Borcherds [Bo2, Theorem 3.1], it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}} \left\{ c^+(-m), [\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(m) : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)}] \right\} = 0$$

for every weakly harmonic form $f \in M^!_{2-n}(S_{\mathscr{L}})$ with holomorphic part (8.0.3). But this is clear:

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}} \left\{ c^+(-m), [\widehat{\mathtt{Z}}^{\mathrm{total}}_{\mathscr{L}}(m) : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)}] \right\} = [\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) : \mathtt{Y}_{\mathscr{L}}]$$

by (8.3.1), and the vanishing of the right hand side follows from Theorem 8.2.2, after noting that $\xi(f) = 0$ by the exactness of (2.2.4). □

*Remark* 8.3.5. To obtain Theorem B of the introduction, evaluate the $S^\vee_{\mathscr{L}}$ valued modular form of Theorem 8.3.4 at the characteristic function $\varphi_0 \in S_{\mathscr{L}}$ of 0 to obtain a scalar valued modular form.

# 9. Scalar valued modular forms

In this section, we reformulate our main result, Theorem 8.2.2, in terms of scalar valued modular forms. The data $(\mathscr{L}_0, \Lambda)$ and $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{L}_0 \oplus \Lambda$ remain fixed, as in earlier sections. Abbreviate $D = |d_{\boldsymbol{k}}|$, and recall our running assumption that $D$ is odd. In particular, $D \equiv 3 \pmod 4$.

## 9.1. **Preliminaries.**

Recall that $\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is the idele class character associated to the quadratic field $\boldsymbol{k}$. If we view $\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ as a Dirichlet character modulo $D$, then any factorization $D = Q_1 Q_2$ induces a factorization

$$\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}} = \chi_{Q_1}\chi_{Q_2}$$

where $\chi_{Q_i} : (\mathbb{Z}/Q_i\mathbb{Z})^\times \to \mathbb{C}^\times$ is a quadratic Dirichlet character. For each positive divisor $Q \mid D$, fix a matrix

$$R_Q = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \frac{D}{Q}\gamma & Q\delta \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma_0(D/Q)$$

with $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}$, and define the Aktin-Lehner operator

$$W_Q = \begin{pmatrix} Q\alpha & \beta \\ D\gamma & Q\delta \end{pmatrix} = R_Q \begin{pmatrix} Q & \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Fix a normalized cuspidal new eigenform

$$g = \sum_m a(m) q^m \in S_n(\Gamma_0(D), \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^n).$$

For every divisor $Q \mid D$, define another modular form $g_Q(\tau) = \sum a_Q(m) q^m$ by the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} a_Q(m) &= \chi_Q^n(m) a(m) \quad \text{if } (m, Q) = 1, \\ a_Q(m) &= \chi_{D/Q}^n(m) \overline{a(m)} \quad \text{if } (m, D/Q) = 1, \\ a_Q(m_1 m_2) &= a_Q(m_1) a_Q(m_2) \quad \text{if } (m_1, m_2) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

According to [As, Theorem 2], the relation

$$g|_n W_Q = \chi_Q^n(\beta)\chi_{D/Q}^n(\alpha)\epsilon_Q(g) \cdot g_Q \tag{9.1.1}$$

holds for the fourth root of unity $\epsilon_Q(g)$ defined by

$$\epsilon_Q(g) = \prod_{q \mid Q} \chi_Q^n(Q/q) \cdot \lambda_q,$$

where

$$\lambda_q = \overline{a(q)} \cdot \begin{cases} -q^{1-\frac{n}{2}} & \text{if } n \equiv 0 \pmod 2, \\ \delta_q q^{\frac{1-n}{2}} & \text{if } n \equiv 1 \pmod 2, \end{cases}$$

and $\delta_q$ is defined by

$$\delta_q = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } q \equiv 1 \pmod 4, \\ i & \text{if } q \equiv 3 \pmod 4. \end{cases} \tag{9.1.2}$$

*Remark* 9.1.1. If $n$ is even, then the Fourier coefficients of $g$ are totally real. It follows that $g_Q = g$, and $g|_n W_Q = \epsilon_Q(g) g$ for every divisor $Q \mid D$. Furthermore,

$$\epsilon_Q(g) = -p^{1-\frac{n}{2}} a(p) = \pm 1.$$

Define a vector valued modular form $\vec{g} \in S_n(\bar{\omega}_{\mathscr{L}})^{\Delta}$ by

$$\vec{g}(\tau) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_0(D)\backslash \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})} (g|_n\gamma)(\tau) \cdot \overline{\omega(\gamma^{-1})\varphi_0}, \tag{9.1.3}$$

where $\varphi_0 \in S_{\mathscr{L}}$ is the characteristic function of $0 \in \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$. The construction $g \mapsto \vec{g}$ defines a surjection

$$S_n(\Gamma_0(D), \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^n) \to S_n(\bar{\omega}_{\mathscr{L}})^{\Delta}$$

by [Sch2, Corollary 5.5], but we will never need this fact. There is an adjoint construction

$$M_{n-1}(\omega_\Lambda^\vee) \to M_{n-1}(\Gamma_0(D), \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{n-1})$$

from $S_\Lambda^\vee$ valued modular forms to scalar valued modular forms, defined by evaluation at $\varphi_0 \in S_\Lambda$. This map takes the vector valued theta series $\theta_\Lambda \in M_{n-1}(\omega_\Lambda^\vee)$ to the scalar valued theta series

$$\theta_\Lambda^{\mathrm{sc}}(\tau) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} R_\Lambda^{\mathrm{sc}}(m) \cdot q^m,$$

where $R_\Lambda^{\mathrm{sc}}(m)$ is the number of ways to represent $m$ by $\Lambda$.

Let $\mathrm{GU}_\Lambda$ be the general unitary group associated with the hermitian lattice $\Lambda$. For any $\mathbb{Z}$-algebra $R$ its $R$-valued points are given by

$$\mathrm{GU}_\Lambda(R) = \{h \in \mathrm{GL}_{\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}}(\Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} R) : \langle hx, hy\rangle = \nu(h)\langle x, y\rangle \text{ for all } x, y \in \Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} R\},$$

where $\nu(h) \in R^\times$ denotes the similitude factor of $h$. Note the relation

$$\mathrm{N}(\det(h)) = \nu(h)^{n-1}. \tag{9.1.4}$$

For $h \in \mathrm{GU}_\Lambda(\mathbb{R})$ the similitude factor $\nu(h)$ belongs to $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Since $\Lambda$ is positive definite, the Shimura variety

$$X_\Lambda = \mathrm{GU}_\Lambda(\mathbb{Q})\backslash \mathrm{GU}_\Lambda(\widehat{\mathbb{Q}})/\mathrm{GU}_\Lambda(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$$

has dimension zero. The natural map $\mathrm{Res}_{\boldsymbol{k}/\mathbb{Q}}\mathbb{G}_m \to \mathrm{GU}_\Lambda$ to the center induces an action of the class group $\mathrm{CL}(\boldsymbol{k}) = \boldsymbol{k}^\times\backslash\widehat{\boldsymbol{k}}^\times/\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^\times$ on $X_\Lambda$:

$$\mathrm{CL}(\boldsymbol{k}) \times X_\Lambda \longrightarrow X_\Lambda, \quad ([\alpha], [h]) \mapsto [\alpha h]. \tag{9.1.5}$$

For any $h \in \mathrm{GU}_\Lambda(\widehat{\mathbb{Q}})$ there exists a unique $\nu_0(h) \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $\nu(h) \in \nu_0(h)\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}^\times$. We define a self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module of signature $(n-1, 0)$ by endowing the $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module

$$\Lambda_h = (\Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}) \cap h\widehat{\Lambda}$$

with the hermitian form

$$\langle x, y\rangle_h = \nu_0(h)^{-1}\langle x, y\rangle.$$

Note that if $h \in \mathrm{GU}_\Lambda(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$, then $\nu_0(h) = 1$ and $\Lambda_h = \Lambda$. If $h \in \mathrm{GU}_\Lambda(\mathbb{Q})$, then $\Lambda_h \cong \Lambda$ as hermitian modules. Hence, the assignment $h \mapsto \Lambda_h$ defines a map from $X_\Lambda$ to the set of isometry classes of self-dual hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$-module of signature $(n-1, 0)$.

Similarly, for any $h \in \mathrm{GU}_\Lambda(\widehat{\mathbb{Q}})$ we define a self-dual incoherent $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module of signature $(1, 0)$ by endowing

$$\mathscr{L}_{0,h} = \det(h)\mathscr{L}_0$$

with the hermitian form

$$\langle x, y\rangle_h = \nu_0(h)^{1-n}\langle x, y\rangle.$$

The assignment $h \mapsto \mathscr{L}_{0,h}$ defines a map from $X_\Lambda$ to the set of isometry classes of self-dual $(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}})$-module of signature $(1, 0)$.

**Lemma 9.1.2.** *For any $h \in \mathrm{GU}_\Lambda(\widehat{\mathbb{Q}})$ we have $\mathscr{L} \cong \mathscr{L}_{0,h} \oplus \Lambda_h$.*

*Proof.* Let $p$ be a prime. Recall from Section 2.1 that a hermitian space over $\boldsymbol{k}_p$ is determined by its dimension and invariant. The relations

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\Lambda_h \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}_p) &= \nu_0(h)^{1-n} \det(\Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}_p), \\ \det(\mathscr{L}_{0,h} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}_p) &= \nu_0(h)^{1-n} \cdot \det(\mathscr{L}_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}_p), \end{aligned}$$

combined with (9.1.4), show that $\mathscr{L} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}_p$ and $(\mathscr{L}_{0,h} \oplus \Lambda_h) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}_p$ have the same local invariant, and hence are isomorphic. A result of Jacobowitz [Jac] shows that every self-dual lattice in $\mathscr{L} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}_p$ is isomorphic to $\mathscr{L} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_p$ as a hermitian $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{k},p}$-module, and so $\mathscr{L} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_p \cong (\mathscr{L}_{0,h} \oplus \Lambda_h) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_p$. This implies the assertion. $\square$

Let $\eta$ be an algebraic automorphic form for $\mathrm{GU}_\Lambda$ which is trivial at $\infty$ and right $\mathrm{GU}_\Lambda(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$-invariant, i.e., a function

$$\eta : X_\Lambda \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}.$$

Throughout we assume that under the action (9.1.5) of $\mathrm{CL}(\boldsymbol{k})$ on $X_\Lambda$ the function $\eta$ transforms with a character $\chi_\eta : \mathrm{CL}(\boldsymbol{k}) \to \mathbb{C}^\times$, that is,

$$\eta(\alpha h) = \chi_\eta(\alpha)\eta(h). \tag{9.1.6}$$

We associate a theta function with $\eta$ by putting

$$\theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\eta,\Lambda} = \sum_{h \in X_\Lambda} \frac{\eta(h)}{|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda_h)|} \cdot \theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\Lambda_h} \in M_{n-1}(\Gamma_0(D), \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{n-1}).$$

This form is cuspidal when the the character $\chi_\eta$ is non-trivial. We denote its Fourier expansion by

$$\theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\eta,\Lambda}(\tau) = \sum_{m \geq 0} R^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\eta,\Lambda}(m) \cdot q^m.$$

Similarly, we may define

$$\theta_{\eta,\Lambda}(\tau) = \sum_{h \in X_\Lambda} \frac{\eta(h)}{|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda_h)|} \cdot \theta_{\Lambda_h}(\tau), \tag{9.1.7}$$

but this is only a formal sum: as $h$ varies the forms $\theta_{\Lambda_h}$ take values in the varying spaces $S^\vee_{\Lambda_h}$.

Lemma 9.1.2 allows us to make sense of the convolution $L$-function $L(\vec{g}, \theta_{\Lambda_h}, s)$ of Section 6.4, and to define

$$L(\vec{g}, \theta_{\eta,\Lambda}, s) = \sum_{h \in X_\Lambda} \frac{\eta(h)}{|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda_h)|} \cdot L(\vec{g}, \theta_{\Lambda_h}, s). \tag{9.1.8}$$

In the next subsection we will compare this to the convolution $L$-function

$$L(g, \theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\eta,\Lambda}, s) = \Gamma\Big(\frac{s}{2} + n - 1\Big) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{\overline{a(m)} R^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\eta,\Lambda}(m)}{(4\pi m)^{\frac{s}{2}+n-1}} \tag{9.1.9}$$

of the scalar valued forms $g$ and $\theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\eta,\Lambda}$.

9.2. **Rankin-Selberg $L$-functions for scalar and vector valued forms.** In this subsection we prove a precise relation between (9.1.8) and (9.1.9). First, we give an explicit formula for the Fourier coefficients of $\vec{g}$ in terms of those of $g$.

Recall that $\mathscr{V}$ is the hermitian space over $\mathbb{A}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ attached to $\mathscr{L}$. Let $\psi = \prod \psi_p$ be the usual unramified additive character of $\mathbb{Q}\backslash\mathbb{A}$, satisfying $\psi_\infty(x) = e(x)$. Recall that the Weil representation $\omega = \omega_{\mathscr{V},\psi}$ of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{A})$ on the space of Schwartz-Bruhat functions $S(\mathscr{V})$ is determined by the formulas

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(n(b))\varphi(x) &= \psi(b\langle x,x\rangle)\varphi(x) \\ \omega(m(a))\varphi(x) &= \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^n(a)|a|^{n+1}\varphi(ax) \\ \omega(w)\varphi(x) &= \gamma(\mathscr{V})\int_{\mathscr{V}} \varphi(y)\psi(-\operatorname{tr}_{\boldsymbol{k}/\mathbb{Q}}\langle x,y\rangle)\,dy \end{aligned}$$

for all $b \in \mathbb{A}$ and $a \in \mathbb{A}^\times$, where

$$n(b) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad m(a) = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & a^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad w = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$dy$ is the self-dual Haar measure with respect to $\psi(\operatorname{tr}_{\boldsymbol{k}/\mathbb{Q}}\langle x,y\rangle)$, and $\gamma(\mathscr{V}) = \prod_{p\le\infty}\gamma_p(\mathscr{V})$ is a certain 8th root of unity (the product of the local Weil indices). For any $Q \mid D$, define

$$\gamma_Q(\mathscr{V}) = \prod_{p\mid Q}\gamma_p(\mathscr{V}).$$

**Lemma 9.2.1.** *Every finite prime $p$ satisfies*

$$\gamma_p(\mathscr{V}) = \begin{cases} \delta_p^{-n}\cdot\chi_{\boldsymbol{k},p}^n(p)\cdot\operatorname{inv}_p(\mathscr{V}) & \text{if } p \mid D, \\ \operatorname{inv}_p(\mathscr{V}) & \text{if } p \nmid D, \end{cases}$$

*where $\delta_p$ is defined by (9.1.2), and* $\operatorname{inv}_p(\mathscr{V})$ *is the local invariant of $\mathscr{V}_p$ defined in Section 2.1.*

*Proof.* Let $\mathscr{V}_p^0$ be $\mathscr{V}_p$ with the $\mathbb{Q}_p$-quadratic form $Q(x) = \langle x,x\rangle$. This is slightly different from the space $R\mathscr{V}_p$ of [Ku1]. By [Ku1, Theorem 3.1] and [Ku1, Lemma 3.4], one has (in the notation of [*loc. cit.*]) that

$$\gamma_p(\mathscr{V}) = \beta_{\mathscr{V}_p}(w) = \gamma_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(\psi_p\circ\mathscr{V}_p^0)^{-1} = \gamma_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(\det\mathscr{V}^0,\psi_p)^{-1}\gamma_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(\psi)^{-2n}h_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(\mathscr{V}_p^0)^{-1}.$$

Here $h_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(\mathscr{V}_p^0)$ is the Hasse invariant of $\mathscr{V}_p^0$, and $\det\mathscr{V}_p^0 = (\det\mathscr{V}_p)^2D^n$ is the determinant of $\mathscr{V}_p^0$. A direct calculation gives

$$h_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(\mathscr{V}_p^0) = (D,D)_p^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}}\operatorname{inv}_p(\mathscr{V}).$$

On the other hand, [Ra, Appendix A.5] implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(D^n,\psi_p)\gamma_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(\psi)^{2n} &= \gamma_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(D,\psi_p)^n(D,D)_p^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}}\gamma_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(-1,\psi_p)^{-n} \\ &= \gamma_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(-D,-\psi_p)^n(-D,-1)_p^n(D,D)_p^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying [Ra, Proposition A.11] and [Ra, Proposition A.9] shows that

$$\gamma_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(-D,-\psi_p) = \begin{cases} (p,D)_p\delta_p & \text{if } p \mid D, \\ 1 & \text{if } p \nmid D. \end{cases}$$

Putting everything together and using $\chi_{\boldsymbol{k},p}(x) = (-D, x)_p$ yields the formula in the lemma. For example, when $p|D$,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_p(\mathscr{V})^{-1} &= \gamma_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(D^n, \psi_p)\gamma_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(\psi)^{2n} h_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(\mathscr{V}_p^0) \\ &= \delta_p^n \mathrm{inv}_p(\mathscr{V})(D,p)_p^n(-D,-1)_p^n \\ &= \delta_p^n \chi_{\boldsymbol{k},p}^n(p)\mathrm{inv}_p(\mathscr{V})(-Dp,-1)_p^n \\ &= \delta_p^n \chi_{\boldsymbol{k},p}^n(p)\mathrm{inv}_p(\mathscr{V}), \end{aligned}$$

as $(-Dp,-1)_p = (-D/p,-1)_p = 1$. □

*Remark* 9.2.2. If $n$ is even and $p \mid D$, the equality of Lemma 9.2.1 simplifies to

$$\gamma_p(\mathscr{V}) = \left(\frac{-1}{p}\right)^{n/2} \mathrm{inv}_p(\mathscr{V}).$$

*Remark* 9.2.3. In the special case where $D$ is prime, the root of unity $\gamma_D(\mathscr{V})$ can be made even more explicit. Indeed, the self-duality of $\mathscr{L}$ implies that $\mathrm{inv}_p(\mathscr{V}) = 1$ for all $p \neq D$, and so the incoherence condition on $\mathscr{V}$ forces $\mathrm{inv}_D(\mathscr{V}) = -1$. Similar reasoning shows that $\chi_{\boldsymbol{k},p}(p) = 1$, and so

$$\gamma_D(\mathscr{V}) = i^{-n}\mathrm{inv}_D(\mathscr{V}) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{\frac{n}{2}+1} & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ i^n & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

For any $Q \mid D$ and $\mu \in \mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_f/\mathscr{L}_f$, define

$$Q_\mu = \prod_{\substack{p|D \\ \mu_p \neq 0}} p,$$

where $\mu_p$ is the image of $\mu$ in $\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\mathscr{L}_{f,p}/\mathscr{L}_{f,p}$. Let $\varphi_\mu \in S_{\mathscr{L}}$ be the characteristic function of $\mu$.

**Proposition 9.2.4.** *Let $g = \sum_m a(m)q^m$ and $\vec{g}$ be as in the previous subsection. Define*

$$a(m,\mu) = \sum_{Q_\mu|Q|D} Q^{1-n}\epsilon_Q(g)\overline{\gamma_Q(\mathscr{V})}a_Q(mQ)$$

*and $\vec{a}(m) = \sum_\mu a(m,\mu)\varphi_\mu \in S_{\mathscr{L}}$. Then $\vec{g}$ has the Fourier expansion*

$$\vec{g}(\tau) = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}} \vec{a}(m)q^m.$$

*Proof.* The statement can be deduced from the definition (9.1.3), using the decomposition

$$\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) = \bigsqcup_{Q|D}\bigsqcup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}/Q\mathbb{Z}} \Gamma_0(D)R_Q n(j)$$

and identity (9.1.1). We refer the reader to [Sch1, Theorem 6.5] for a more general result. □

**Proposition 9.2.5.** *The convolution L-function (6.4.1) satisfies*

$$L(\vec{g},\theta_\Lambda,s) = \sum_{Q|D} Q^{\frac{s}{2}}\overline{\epsilon_Q(g)}\gamma_Q(\mathscr{V})L(g_Q,\theta_{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{q}}}^{\mathrm{sc}},s),$$

*where* $\mathfrak{q} \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{k}}^\times$ *is such that* $\mathfrak{q}^2\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^\times = Q\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^\times$*. Moreover, for any* $\eta : X_\Lambda \to \mathbb{C}$ *satisfying* (9.1.6) *the L-functions (9.1.8) and (9.1.9) are related by*

$$L(\vec{g}, \theta_{\eta,\Lambda}, s) = \sum_{Q\mid D} Q^{\frac{s}{2}} \overline{\epsilon_Q(g)} \gamma_Q(\mathscr{V}) \chi_\eta(\mathfrak{q}^{-1}) L(g_Q, \theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\eta,\Lambda}, s).$$

*Proof.* Proposition 9.2.4 implies

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{L(\vec{g},\theta_\Lambda,s)}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2}+n-1)} &= \sum_{\mu\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\Lambda/\Lambda} \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}} \sum_{Q_\mu\mid Q\mid D} Q^{1-n}\overline{\epsilon_Q(g)}\gamma_Q(\mathscr{V}) \cdot \frac{\overline{a_Q(mQ)} R_\Lambda(m,\varphi_\mu)}{(4\pi m)^{\frac{s}{2}+n-1}} \\ &= \sum_{Q\mid D} Q^{1-n}\overline{\epsilon_Q(g)}\gamma_Q(\mathscr{V}) \sum_{m\in\frac{1}{Q}\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \frac{\overline{a_Q(mQ)}}{(4\pi m)^{\frac{s}{2}+n-1}} \sum_{\substack{\mu\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\Lambda/\Lambda \\ Q_\mu\mid Q}} R_\Lambda(m,\varphi_\mu) \\ &= \sum_{Q\mid D} Q^{\frac{s}{2}}\overline{\epsilon_Q(g)}\gamma_Q(\mathscr{V}) \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \frac{\overline{a_Q(m)}}{(4\pi m)^{\frac{s}{2}+n-1}} \sum_{\substack{\mu\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\Lambda/\Lambda \\ Q_\mu\mid Q}} R_\Lambda(m/Q,\varphi_\mu).\end{aligned}$$

The first claim now follows from the relation

$$\sum_{\substack{\mu\in\mathfrak{d}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{-1}\Lambda/\Lambda \\ Q_\mu\mid Q}} R_\Lambda(m/Q,\mu) = R_{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{q}^{-1}}}(m,0) = R_{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{q}}}(m,0).$$

For the second claim, if we replace $\Lambda$ by $\Lambda_h$ and $\mathscr{L}_0$ by $\mathscr{L}_{0,h}$ for $h \in X_\Lambda$, then $\mathscr{L}$ and $\gamma_Q(\mathscr{V})$ remain unchanged. The above calculations therefore imply that

$$\begin{aligned}L(\vec{g},\theta_{\eta,\Lambda},s) &= \sum_{Q\mid D} \overline{\epsilon_Q(g)}\gamma_Q(\mathscr{V})Q^{\frac{s}{2}} \sum_{h\in X_\Lambda} \frac{\eta(h)}{|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda_h)|} L(g_Q,\theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{q}h}},s) \\ &= \sum_{Q\mid D} \overline{\epsilon_Q(g)}\gamma_Q(\mathscr{V})Q^{\frac{s}{2}} \sum_{h\in X_\Lambda} \frac{\eta(\mathfrak{q}^{-1}h)}{|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda_h)|} L(g_Q,\theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\Lambda_h},s) \\ &= \sum_{Q\mid D} Q^{\frac{s}{2}}\overline{\epsilon_Q(g)}\gamma_Q(\mathscr{V})\chi_\eta(\mathfrak{q}^{-1}) L(g_Q,\theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\eta,\Lambda},s).\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used (9.1.6) and the fact that $|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda_h)|$ is equal to $|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{q}h})|$. This proves the proposition. ☐

**Corollary 9.2.6.** *If $n$ is even, then*

$$L(\vec{g},\theta_{\eta,\Lambda},s) = L(g,\theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\eta,\Lambda},s) \cdot \prod_{p\mid D} \big(1 + \chi_\eta(\mathfrak{p}^{-1})\epsilon_p(g)\gamma_p(\mathscr{V})p^{\frac{s}{2}}\big).$$

*Proof.* This is immediate from Proposition 9.2.5 and Remark 9.1.1. ☐

9.3. **The main result, second form.** Now we are ready to state the main result in terms of scalar valued modular forms. For every $h \in X_\Lambda$, the isomorphism $\mathscr{L} \cong \mathscr{L}_{0,h} \oplus \Lambda_h$ of Lemma 9.1.2 allows us to define a codimension $n-1$ cycle

$$\mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_{0,h},\Lambda_h)} \longrightarrow \mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}.$$

Recall that the degree $\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_{0,h},\Lambda_h)}$ is given by the explicit formula in Remark 6.1.4. Each algebraic automorphic form $\eta : X_\Lambda \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfying (9.1.6) now determines a cycle

$$\eta \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} = \sum_{h \in X_\Lambda} \eta(h) \cdot \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_{0,h},\Lambda_h)}$$

on $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}$ with complex coefficients, and a corresponding linear functional $\widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}) \to \mathbb{C}$ denoted

$$\widehat{\mathtt{Z}} \mapsto [\widehat{\mathtt{Z}} : \eta \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}].$$

When the character $\chi_\eta$ is non-trivial, then $\eta \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}(\mathbb{C})$ has degree zero. Under the assumption of Proposition 6.1.5, this cycle actually has degree zero on each component of $\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}}(\mathbb{C})$.

Starting with the form $g \in S_n(\Gamma_0(D), \chi^n_{\boldsymbol{k}})$ of Section 9.1, pick any $f$ mapping to $\vec{g}$ under the differential operator

$$\xi : H_{2-n}(\omega_{\mathscr{L}}) \longrightarrow S_n(\bar{\omega}_{\mathscr{L}})$$

of (2.2.3), and let

$$\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) \in \widehat{\mathrm{CH}}^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}^*_{\mathscr{L}})$$

be the arithmetic cycle class of Definition 8.2.1. Combining Theorem 8.2.2 with Proposition 9.2.5 and Corollary 9.2.6, we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 9.3.1.** *In the notation above,*

$$[\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) : \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] = -\deg_{\mathbb{C}} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)} \cdot \sum_{Q \mid D} Q^{\frac{s}{2}} \overline{\epsilon_Q(g)} \gamma_Q(\mathscr{V}) L'(g_Q, \theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{q}}}, 0),$$

*where* $\mathfrak{q} \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{k}}^\times$ *is such that* $\mathfrak{q}^2 \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\times_{\boldsymbol{k}} = Q \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\times_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. *Moreover, if* $n$ *is even, and* $\eta : X_\Lambda \to \mathbb{C}$ *satisfies* (9.1.6)*, then*

$$[\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f) : \eta \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda)}] = -2^{1-o(d_{\boldsymbol{k}})} \frac{h^2_{\boldsymbol{k}}}{w^2_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \cdot \frac{d}{ds} \Big[ L(g, \theta^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\eta,\Lambda}, s) \cdot \prod_{p \mid D} \big( 1 + \chi_\eta(\mathfrak{p}^{-1}) \epsilon_p(g) \gamma_p(\mathscr{V}) p^{\frac{s}{2}} \big) \Big] \Big|_{s=0},$$

*where* $\mathfrak{p} \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{k}}^\times$ *such that* $\mathfrak{p}^2 \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\times_{\boldsymbol{k}} = p \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\times_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. *Note that in the first formula the sum is over all positive divisors* $Q \mid D$*, while in the second the product is over the prime divisors* $p \mid D$*. In both formulas, the choice of* $\mathscr{L}_0$ *intervenes on the right hand side only through the factors* $\gamma_Q(\mathscr{V})$*.*

9.4. **The Rankin-Selberg convolution with an Eisenstein series.** In this subsection, we assume throughout that $D$ *is prime* and that $g \in S_n(\Gamma_0(D), \chi^n_{\boldsymbol{k}})$ is a newform with Fourier expansion $g = \sum_m a(m) q^m$. Then the twist $g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}} = \sum \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(m) a(m) q^m$ by the quadratic character $\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is a newform in $S_n(\Gamma_0(D^2), \chi^n_{\boldsymbol{k}})$.

We consider a special example of an algebraic automorphic form for $\mathrm{GU}_\Lambda$, namely the function $\eta$ given by

$$\eta(h) = \begin{cases} \Big( \sum_{\Lambda_1 \in \mathrm{gen}(\Lambda)} \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda_1)|} \Big)^{-1} & \text{if } h \in \mathrm{GU}_\Lambda(\mathbb{Q}) \, \mathrm{U}_\Lambda(\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}) \, \mathrm{GU}_\Lambda(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Notice that it satisfies (9.1.6) with $\chi_\eta = 1$ (since $D$ is prime, every ideal class of $\boldsymbol{k}$ can be represented by $\mathfrak{a}\overline{\mathfrak{a}}^{-1}$). We write

$$\mathtt{Y}_{\mathrm{gen}(\Lambda)} = \eta \mathtt{Y}_{\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda} = \Bigg( \sum_{\Lambda_1 \in \mathrm{gen}(\Lambda)} \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Aut}(\Lambda_1)|} \Bigg)^{-1} \sum_{\Lambda_1 \in \mathrm{gen}(\Lambda)} \mathtt{Y}_{(\mathscr{L}_0,\Lambda_1)}.$$

Consider the normalized genus theta function

$$E(\tau) = \kappa(n) \left(\frac{\sqrt{D}}{2\pi}\right)^{n-1} L(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{n-1}, n-1)\Gamma(n-1)\theta_{\eta,\Lambda},$$

where $\kappa(n) = 1/2$ or $1$ depending on whether $n = 2$ or $n > 2$. Its associated scalar form $E^{\mathrm{sc}}(\tau) \in M_{n-1}(\Gamma_0(D), \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{n-1})$ is a normalized Eisenstein series by the Siegel-Weil formula.

In this subsection we relate the derivative $L'(\vec{g}, E, 0)$ to derivatives (and values) of the usual Hecke $L$-functions of $g$ and $g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}$. The results will be expressed in terms of the completed $L$-functions

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}, s) &= D^{\frac{s}{2}} \pi^{-\frac{s+1}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{s+1}{2}\right) L(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}, s),\\
\Lambda(g, s) &= \left(\frac{\sqrt{D}}{2\pi}\right)^{s} \Gamma(s) L(g, s),\\
\Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, s) &= \left(\frac{D}{2\pi}\right)^{s} \Gamma(s) L(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, s).
\end{aligned}$$

Although the method is the same, we obtain slightly different results depending on whether $n$ is even or odd. We first consider the case that $n$ is even. The next proposition follows from an explicit calculation using [KY] and [Ya, Section 3].

**Proposition 9.4.1.** *Assume that $n$ is even, and write*

$$E^{\mathrm{sc}}(\tau) = b(0) + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} b(m) m^{n-2} q^m.$$

*Each $b(m)$ has a factorization $b(m) = b_D(m) b^D(m)$ in which*

$$b_D(m) = 1 + (-D)^{\frac{2-n}{2}} \chi_{\boldsymbol{k},D}(m) D^{(2-n)\operatorname{ord}_D(m)},$$

*and $b^D(m) = \prod_{p \neq D} b_p(p^{\operatorname{ord}_p m})$ with*

$$b_p(p^k) = \frac{1 - \left(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k},p}(p) p^{2-n}\right)^{k+1}}{1 - \chi_{\boldsymbol{k},p}(p) p^{2-n}}$$

*for all $p \neq D$.*

**Proposition 9.4.2.** *If $n$ is even, then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&(-4)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} D^{n-1} \Lambda(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}, s+1) L(\vec{g}, E, s)\\
&\quad = \ (D^{-\frac{s}{4}} - (-1)^{\frac{n}{2}} \epsilon_D(g) D^{\frac{s}{4}})\\
&\qquad \times \left[\Lambda(g, 1+\frac{s}{2}) \Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, 1-\frac{s}{2}) + (-1)^{\frac{n}{2}} \epsilon_D(g) \Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, 1+\frac{s}{2}) \Lambda(g, 1-\frac{s}{2})\right].
\end{aligned}$$

*In particular, when $n = 2$, one has*

$$D\Lambda(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}, s+1) L(\vec{g}, E, s) = 2(D^{-\frac{s}{4}} + \epsilon_D(g) D^{\frac{s}{4}}) \Lambda(g, 1+\frac{s}{2}) \Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, 1+\frac{s}{2}).$$

*Proof.* Since $n$ is even, the cusp form $g$ has trivial nebentypus character, and we have the functional equations

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda(g, s) &= i^n \epsilon_D(g) \Lambda(g, n-s),\\
\Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, s) &= -i^n \Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, n-s).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the latter identity follows from the fact that

$$g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \mid W_{D^2} = -g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, \tag{9.4.1}$$

which can be proved similarly as [Mi, Lemma 4.3.10].

We abbreviate

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{a(m)b(m)}{m^{\frac{s}{2}+1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{(1+(-1)^{\frac{n}{2}+1}\epsilon_D(g)D^{\frac{s}{2}})} \cdot \frac{(4\pi)^{\frac{s}{2}+n-1}}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2}+n-1)} \cdot L(\vec{g}, E, s). \end{aligned}$$

Here the second equality follows from Corollary 9.2.6 and the relation $\overline{a(m)} = a(m)$ noted in Remark 9.1.1. Proposition 9.4.1 implies

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \sum_{(m,D)=1} \frac{a(m)b^D(m)}{m^{\frac{s}{2}+1}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{a(D)^k b_D(mD^k)}{D^{k(\frac{s}{2}+1)}} \\ &= \frac{1}{1-a(D)D^{-\frac{s}{2}-1}} \sum_{(m,D)=1} \frac{a(m)b^D(m)}{m^{\frac{s}{2}+1}} \\ &\quad + \frac{(-D)^{\frac{2-n}{2}}}{1-a(D)D^{-(\frac{s}{2}+n-1)}} \sum_{(m,D)=1} \frac{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k},D}(m)a(m)b^D(m)}{m^{\frac{s}{2}+1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{1-a(D)D^{-\frac{s}{2}-1}} \prod_{p\neq D} L_p(1) + \frac{(-D)^{\frac{2-n}{2}}}{1-a(D)D^{-(\frac{s}{2}+n-1)}} \prod_{p\neq D} L_p(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}), \end{aligned}$$

where for an idele class character $\chi$ of $\mathbb{Q}$ we denote

$$L_p(\chi) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\chi_p(p)^k a(p^k) b_p(p^k)}{p^{k(\frac{s}{2}+1)}}.$$

Write

$$L_p(g,s) = \frac{1}{(1-\alpha(p)p^{-s})(1-\beta(p)p^{-s})},$$

where $\alpha(p)$ and $\beta(p)$ are the roots of $X^2 - a(p)X + p^{n-1}$. Proposition 9.4.1 now implies

$$L_p(\chi) = \frac{L_p(g_\chi, \frac{s}{2}+1)L_p(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, \frac{s}{2}+n-1)}{L_p(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}, s+1)}.$$

Putting everything together, and using $L_D(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, s) = 1$ and $L_D(g,s) = \frac{1}{1-a(D)D^{-s}}$, gives

$$L = \frac{L(g, \frac{s}{2}+1)L(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, \frac{s}{2}+n-1) + (-D)^{\frac{2-n}{2}} L(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, \frac{s}{2}+1)L(g, \frac{s}{2}+n-1)}{L(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}, s+1)}.$$

Using the functional equations for $\Lambda(g,s)$ and $\Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, s)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &(-1)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} 2^{n-2} D^{n-1} \Lambda(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}, s+1) L(\vec{g}, E, s) \\ &= (D^{-\frac{s}{4}} - (-1)^{\frac{n}{2}}\epsilon_D(g)D^{\frac{s}{4}}) \\ &\quad \times \Big[(-1)^{\frac{2-n}{2}}\Lambda(g, \frac{s}{2}+1)\Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, \frac{s}{2}+n-1) + \Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, \frac{s}{2}+1)\Lambda(g, \frac{s}{2}+n-1)\Big] \\ &= (D^{-\frac{s}{4}} - (-1)^{\frac{n}{2}}\epsilon_D(g)D^{\frac{s}{4}}) \\ &\quad \times \Big[\Lambda(g, 1+\frac{s}{2})\Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, 1-\frac{s}{2}) + (-1)^{\frac{n}{2}}\epsilon_D(g)\Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}, 1+\frac{s}{2})\Lambda(g, 1-\frac{s}{2})\Big] \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. □

**Corollary 9.4.3.** *Assume that $n$ is even, and put*

$$C(n)=(-1)^{\frac{n}{2}}\frac{2\pi^{\frac{n}{2}-1}\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}{D^{n-1}\Gamma(n-1)\Lambda(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},1)\Lambda(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},n-1)}.$$

(1) *If $n>2$ and $(-1)^{\frac{n}{2}}\epsilon_D(g)=1$, then*

$$[\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f):\mathtt{Y}_{\mathrm{gen}(\Lambda)}]=-C(n)\deg_{\mathbb{C}}\mathtt{Y}_{\mathrm{gen}(\Lambda)}\cdot\log(D)\cdot\Lambda(g,1)\Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}},1).$$

(2) *If $n>2$ and $(-1)^{\frac{n}{2}}\epsilon_D(g)=-1$, then*

$$[\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f):\mathtt{Y}_{\mathrm{gen}(\Lambda)}]=2C(n)\deg_{\mathbb{C}}\mathtt{Y}_{\mathrm{gen}(\Lambda)}\cdot\frac{d}{ds}\big[\Lambda(g,s+1)\Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}},1-s)\big]|_{s=0}.$$

(3) *If $n=2$, then*

$$[\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f):\mathtt{Y}_{\mathrm{gen}(\Lambda)}]=D^{-1}\cdot\begin{cases}\log(D)\cdot\Lambda(g,1)\Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}},1) & \text{if } \epsilon_D(g)=-1,\\ -2\Lambda'(g,1)\Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}},1) & \text{if } \epsilon_D(g)=1.\end{cases}$$

*Note that the case $n=2$ is special, as $s=1$ is the center of the functional equation of $L(g,s)$.*

*Proof.* It is clear from Theorem 8.2.2 and the definitions that

$$[\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f):\mathtt{Y}_{\mathrm{gen}(\Lambda)}]=\frac{C(n)}{\kappa(n)}\cdot\frac{h_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2}{w_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2}\cdot(-4)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}D^{n-1}\Lambda(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},1)L'(\vec{g},E,0).$$

If $\epsilon_D(g)=(-1)^{\frac{n}{2}}$, then Proposition 9.4.2 implies

$$(-4)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}D^{n-1}\Lambda(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},1)L'(\vec{g},E,0)=-\log(D)\cdot\Lambda(g,1)\Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}},1).$$

If instead $\epsilon_D(g)=(-1)^{\frac{n}{2}+1}$, then

$$(-4)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}D^{n-1}\Lambda(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},1)L'(\vec{g},E,0)=2\frac{d}{ds}\big[\Lambda(g,s+1)\Lambda(g_{\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}},1-s)\big]|_{s=0}.$$

All parts of the claim follow from this, together with the class number formula

$$\frac{C(2)}{\kappa(2)}\cdot\frac{h_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2}{w_{\boldsymbol{k}}^2}=-\frac{1}{D}.$$

□

Now we turn to the case where $n$ is odd.

**Proposition 9.4.4.** *Assume that $n$ is odd. The function $b(m)$ defined by*

$$E^{\mathrm{sc}}(\tau)=b(0)+(1-(-D)^{\frac{1-n}{2}})^{-1}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}b(m)m^{n-2}q^m$$

*is multiplicative, and satisfies*

$$b(p^k)=\begin{cases}\frac{1-p^{(2-n)(k+1)}}{1-p^{2-n}} & \text{if } p\neq D,\\ (-D)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\Big[-1+(1+(-D)^{\frac{1-n}{2}})\frac{1-D^{(2-n)(k+1)}}{1-D^{2-n}}\Big] & \text{if } p=D.\end{cases}$$

The following results can be proved analogously to Proposition 9.4.2 and Corollary 9.4.3.

**Proposition 9.4.5.** *If $n$ is odd, then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&2^{n-2}D^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\Lambda(\chi_{\boldsymbol{k}},s+1)(1-(-D)^{\frac{1-n}{2}})L(\vec{g},E,s)\\
&\quad=\ (D^{\frac{s}{4}}-i^n\epsilon_D(g)D^{-\frac{s}{4}})\\
&\qquad\times\Big[D^{-\frac{s}{4}}\Lambda(g,1-\frac{s}{2})\Lambda(g,n-1-\frac{s}{2})+i^n\epsilon_D(g)D^{\frac{s}{4}}\Lambda(g,1+\frac{s}{2})\Lambda(g,n-1+\frac{s}{2})\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

**Corollary 9.4.6.** *Suppose $n$ is odd, and set*

$$C(n)=-\frac{h_{\boldsymbol{k}}}{w_{\boldsymbol{k}}}\frac{\pi^{n-1}}{D^{n-1}\Gamma(n-1)\zeta(n-1)}\frac{1}{(1-(-D)^{\frac{1-n}{2}})}.$$

(1) *If $i^n\epsilon_D(g)=1$, then*

$$[\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f):\mathtt{Y}_{\mathrm{gen}(\Lambda)}]=C(n)\log(D)\cdot\Lambda(g,1)\Lambda(g,n-1).$$

(2) *If $i^n\epsilon_D(g)=-1$, then*

$$[\widehat{\Theta}_{\mathscr{L}}(f):\mathtt{Y}_{\mathrm{gen}(\Lambda)}]=-2C(n)\cdot\frac{d}{ds}\Big[D^{-\frac{s}{2}}\Lambda\big(g,1+s\big)\Lambda\big(g,n-1+s\big)\Big]\big|_{s=0}.$$

## References

[As] *T. Asai*, On the Fourier coefficients of automorphic forms at various cusps and some applications to Rankin's convolution. J. Math. Soc. Japan 28 (1976), 48-61.

[BeOg] *P. Berthelot and A. Ogus*, Notes on Crystalline Cohomology. Princeton University Press, 1978.

[Bo1] *R. E. Borcherds*, Automorphic forms with singularities on Grassmannians. Invent. Math. **132** (1998), 491–562.

[Bo2] *R. Borcherds*, The Gross-Kohnen-Zagier theorem in higher dimensions. Duke Math. J. **97** (1999), 219–233. Correction in: Duke Math J. **105** No. 1 p.183–184.

[Br1] *J. H. Bruinier*, Borcherds products on $\mathrm{O}(2,l)$ and Chern classes of Heegner divisors. Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1780**, Springer-Verlag (2002).

[BBK] *J. H. Bruinier, J. Burgos and U. Kühn*, Borcherds products and arithmetic intersection theory on Hilbert modular surfaces. Duke Math. J. **139** (2007), 1–88.

[BF] *J. H. Bruinier and J. Funke*, On two geometric theta lifts. Duke Math. Journal. **125** (2004), 45–90.

[BY] *J. H. Bruinier and T.H. Yang*, Faltings heights of CM cycles and derivatives of $L$-functions. Invent. Math. **177** (2009), 631–681.

[BKK] *J. Burgos, J. Kramer, and U. Kühn*, Cohomological arithmetic Chow groups. J. Inst. Math. Jussieu. **6** (2007), 1–178.

[Co] *P. Colmez*, Périods des variétés abéliennes à multiplication complexe. Ann. Math. **138** (1993), 625–683 .

[FGA] *B. Fantechi, L. Göttsche, L. Illusie, S. Kleiman, N. Nitsure, A. Vistoli*, Fundamental Algebraic Geometry: Grothendieck's FGA Explained. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Vol. 123, American Mathematical Society, 2005.

[Gr] *B. Gross*, On canonical and quasi-canonical liftings. Invent. Math., **84** (1986), 321–326.

[GZ] *B. Gross and D. Zagier*, Heegner points and derivatives of L-series. Invent. Math. **84** (1986), 225–320.

[Hof] *E. Hofmann*, Automorphic products on unitary groups. Dissertation, Technische Universität Darmstadt (2011).

[Ho1] *B. Howard*, Intersection theory on Shimura surfaces II. Invent. Math. **183**, No. 1, (2011), 1–77.

[Ho2] *B. Howard*, Complex multiplication cycles and Kudla-Rapoport divisors. Annals of Math., **176** (2012), 1097–1171.

[Ho3] *B. Howard*, Complex multiplication cycles and Kudla-Rapoport divisors II. Preprint (2012).

[Jac] *R. Jacobowitz*, Hermitian forms over local fields. Amer. J. Math., **84** (1962), 441–465.

[Kr] *N. Krämer*, Local models for ramified unitary groups. Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg **73** (2003), 67–80.

[Ku1] *S. Kudla*, Splitting meteplectic covers of dual reductive pairs. Israel J. Math., **87** (1994), 361–401.

[Ku2] *S. Kudla*, Algebraic cycles on Shimura varieties of orthogonal type, Duke Math. J. **86** (1997), no. 1, 39–78.

[Ku3] *S. Kudla*, Integrals of Borcherds forms. Compositio Math. **137** (2003), 293–349.

[Ku4] *S. Kudla*, Special cycles and derivatives of Eisenstein series. Heegner points and Rankin L-series, 243–270, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., 49, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004.

[KR1] *S. Kudla and M. Rapoport*, Special cycles on unitary Shimura varieties I. Unramified local theory. Invent. Math. **184** (2011), no. 3, 629–682.

[KR2] *S. Kudla and M. Rapoport*, Special cycles on unitary Shimura varieties II. Global theory. Preprint.

[KRY1] *S. Kudla, M. Rapoport, and T.H. Yang*, On the Derivative of an Eisenstein series of Weight One. Internat. Math. Res. Notices 1999, no. 7, 347–385.

[KRY2] *S. Kudla, M. Rapoport, and T.H. Yang*, Modular Forms and Special Cycles on Shimura Curves. Princeton University Press, (2006).

[KY] *S. Kudla and T.H. Yang*, Eisenstein series for $\mathrm{SL}_2$, Science of China (mathematics), a special volume in honor of Yuan Wang's 80th birthday. 53 (2010), 2275–2316.

[Lan] *K.W. Lan*, Arithmetic Compacitifactions of PEL Shimura Varieties. Thesis, Harvard University, (2008).

[Liu] *Q. Liu*, Algebraic Geometry and Arithmetic Curves. Oxford University Press, (2002).

[Mi] *T. Miyake*, Modular forms. Translated from the Japanese by Yoshitaka Maeda. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989. x+335 pp.

[Pa] *G. Pappas*, On the arithmetic moduli schemes of PEL Shimura varieties. J. Algebraic Geom. **9** (2000), no. 3, 577–605.

[Ra] *R. Ranga Rao*, On some explicit formulas in the theory of Weil representation. Pacific J. Math. **157** (1993), 335–371.

[Sch1] *N. R. Scheithauer*, On the classification of automorphic products and generalized Kac-Moody algebras, Invent. Math. **164** (2006), 641–678.

[Sch2] *N. R. Scheithauer*, Some constructions of modular forms for the Weil representation of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. Preprint (2011).

[Scho] *J. P. Schofer*, Borcherds forms and generalizations of singular moduli. J. Reine Angew. Math. **629** (2009), 1–36.

[Se73] *J. P. Serre*, A Course in Arithmetic. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 7. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1973.

[Se00] *J. P. Serre*, Local Algebra. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000.

[SABK] *C. Soulé, D. Abramovich, J.-F. Burnol, and J. Kramer*, Lectures on Arakelov Geometry. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **33**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1992).

[Vi] *A. Vistoli*, Intersection theory on algebraic stacks and on their moduli spaces. Invent. Math. **97** (1989), no. 3, 613–670.

[Vo] *C. Voisin*, Hodge Theory and Complex Algebraic Geometry I. Cambridge University Press (2002).

[Ya] *T.H. Yang*, An explicit formula for local densities of quadratic forms, J. Number Theory, 72 (1998), 309–356.

Fachbereich Mathematik, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Schlossgartenstrasse 7, D–64289 Darmstadt, Germany
*E-mail address*: `bruinier@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de`

Department of Mathematics, Boston College, 140 Commonwealth Ave, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA
*E-mail address*: `howardbe@bc.edu`

Department of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin Madison, Van Vleck Hall, Madison, WI 53706, USA
*E-mail address*: `thyang@math.wisc.edu`